DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 092 IR 050 914

TITLE The Allocation of Materials Funds. SPEC Kit 36.
INSTITUTION Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C. Office of Management Studies.
PUB DATE Sep 77
NOTE 107p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; *Budgeting; Guidelines; Higher Education; *Library Acquisition; *Library Materials; Program Proposals; *Research Libraries

ABSTRACT

This Association of Research Libraries (ARL) kit contains source documents providing information on the general background, statistics/criteria, formulas, and decision-making processes used in the allocation of materials funds in academic libraries. The kit comprises: (1) a working paper on "Guidelines for the Allocation of Library Materials Budgets" (Subcommittee of Collection Development Committee, Resources Section, Resources and Technical Services Division, American Library Association); (2) "Draft Background Paper on Book Fund Allocations" (University of California at Los Angeles); (3) "ARL's Collection Analysis Project" (Office of Management Studies); (4) "Book Fund Allocation Formula" (Colorado State University); (5) "Changes in Staff and Programs" (University of California at Davis); (6) "Allocation Background Information" (University of Washington); (7) "Book Budget Reallocations, 1976-1979" (University of California at Berkeley); (8) "Memos re Library Response to System Wide Formula for Allocation of Campus Book Budgets" (University of California at Davis); (9) "Guide to Allocation of Book Funds Questionnaire" (University of California at Davis); (10) "The Allocation of Funds within the UCLA Library System" (University of California at Los Angeles); (11) "Minutes--Unit Heads and Bibliographic Meeting" (University of California at Los Angeles); (12) "Guidelines for Budget Allocation for Library Materials" (University of Connecticut); (13) "Memos re 1976-1977 Book Budget" (University of Michigan); (14) "Book Acquisition in McMaster University: A Proposal for Change--Parts I and III" (McMaster University); (15) "Draft of Recommendations from Ad Hoc Selection Policy Committee" (Princeton University); and (16) "The Formulation and Organization of the Annual Program of Acquisitions" (University of Western Ontario). A 15-item bibliography and an evaluation sheet for this ARL Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) kit are provided. (THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

September 1977

Systems and Procedures Exchange Center

ED251092

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

The Allocation of Materials Funds

Kit 36

IR050914

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maxine Sitts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) is operated by the Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Telephone (202) 232-8656.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Office of University Library Management Studies

SPEC KIT EVALUATION

The materials in this Kit were collected from a survey of the member libraries of the Association of Research Libraries. They were selected for inclusion here because they are among the best examples received of current management practices in academic and research libraries.

These documents are working tools developed by individual libraries to meet their specific purposes. The materials are not intended to provide models or prototype systems that can simply be copied by other libraries. Instead, these illustrations should stimulate further innovation and improvement in the management practices of academic and research libraries.

We will appreciate your evaluation of this Kit.

* * *

Subject of Kit _____

How useful did you find this SPEC Flyer and Kit?

Very much _____

Quite a bit _____

Somewhat _____

Not at all _____

How did you use these materials?

What changes in format or content would improve this service's usefulness to your library?

What topics would you like to see covered in the future?

Date _____

Your Name _____

Institution _____

Address _____

_____

ZIP _____

(Fold, staple, stamp, and mail)

STAMP
PLEASE

TO
Association of Research Libraries
Systems and Procedures Exchange Center
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

ISSN 0160-3582

THE ALLOCATION OF MATERIALS FUNDS IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

KIT NO. 36 - SEPTEMBER 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL BACKGROUND

Working Paper
Guidelines for the Allocation of Library Materials Budgets - Subcommittee of Collection Development Committee, Resources Section, RTSD/ALA — 12 pp.

Draft Background Paper on Book Fund Allocations - UCLA — 4 pp.

ARL's Collection Analysis Project - Office of Management Studies — 2 pp.

USE OF A FORMULA

Book Fund Allocation Formula - Colorado State — 10 pp.

STATISTICS/CRITERIA

Changes in Staff and Programs - UC Davis — 2 pp.

Allocation Background Information - University of Washington — 21 pp.

THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Book Budget Reallocations, 1976-1979 - UC Berkley — 4 pp.

Memos re library response to system wide formula for allocation of campus book budgets - UC Davis — 10 pp.

Guide to Allocation of Book Funds Questionnaire - UC Davis — 5 pp.

The Allocation of Funds Within the UCLA Library System - UCLA — 2 pp.

Minutes - Unit Heads and Bibliographic Meeting - UCLA — 3 pp.

Guidelines for Budget Allocation for Library Materials - University of Connecticut — 3 pp.

Memos re 1976/77 Book Budget - University of Michigan — 4 pp.

Book Acquisition in McMaster University: A Proposal for Change - Parts I and III - McMaster — 7 pp.

Draft of Recommendations from Ad Hoc Selection Policy Committee - Princeton — 5 pp.

The Formulation and Organization of the Annual Program of Acquisitions - University of Western Ontario — 3 pp.

WORKING DRAFT

GUIDELINES FOR THE ALLOCATION OF LIBRARY MATERIALS BUDGETS

GENERAL BACKGROUND
Subcommittee, RTSD
12pp.

FOREWORD

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose.

These guidelines are offered to assist libraries in deciding how to allocate funds for library materials, whether through use of a published formula or a method devised locally.

1.2 Objectives.

The Committee has attempted to bring together in one place the elements to be considered in the allocation process, and the published formulas available to date.

1.3 Need.

Reductions in budget size and greater accountability for specific budget expenditures require that the allocation of funds for library materials be done in a manner that is both understandable and justifiable. An allocation method based on recognized criteria is more likely to meet with acceptance and approval, and it can serve as a valuable planning tool.

1.4 Scope.

The guidelines are designed to aid libraries of all kinds and sizes in determining the most useful way of allocating funds for library materials. Some of the formulas described will be applicable only to large research libraries.

1.5 Audience.

These guidelines are intended to assist library budget officers, administrators and staff involved in the allocation of the library's materials funds. These guidelines are also intended to aid in communicating the allocation process to library users, to other library staff, and to non-library administrators who have a role in budget allocation and approval.

1.6 Methodology.

These guidelines were drafted by a Subcommittee of the Collection Development Committee and submitted to the full Committee in open meetings at several ALA Midwinter and Annual Conferences. During this same period, the Committee sponsored a program on the allocation of book funds of the Annual Conference in 1974, and at one of its meetings at the Annual Conference in July 1975 it invited several visitors with experience in the development of allocation formulas to share their methods and ideas with members of the Committee. This, and subsequent group discussions, led to extensive revisions of the initial draft of the guidelines.

1.7 Assumptions.

1.7.1 A rational method for the allocation of funds for library materials is desirable. Each institution will need to develop its own method for allocation which will apply to its own circumstances; however, existing formulas can be (and have been) used as models to assist individual institutions in this process.

a) Open up the allocation process and force assumptions to be verbalized.

b) Provide for a planned and logical distribution of available funds based on the library's goals and priorities.

c) Enable the library to monitor expenditures of funds.

d) Enable the library to demonstrate to both fiscal authorities and patrons how money is being allocated and spent.

e) Provide a method for fulfilling collection goals and needs.

1.7.2 In a climate of budget restraints and tighter fiscal control, it becomes increasingly necessary to use some method of allocation, even if one was not used in the past, to ensure that all parts of the collection receive consideration and an appropriate share of the funds.

1.7.3 In an era of resource-sharing, a rational method for the allocation of funds of one's own institution are being met without wasteful overlap and duplication with other institutions.

1.8 Definitions.

a) Allocation - assignment of a portion of the library materials budget to a particular subject, type of material, etc.

b) Approval plans - materials are selected and supplied by a vendor or publisher based upon an individual profile of library needs. The library has the right to return unsuitable items.

c) Blanket plans - similar to a standing order, but may cover a number of subject areas or series.

d) Budget - funds assigned to the library, usually with a certain portion earmarked for the purchase of library materials.

e) Evaluation - assessment, usually periodic, of the effectiveness of a particular allocation method in achieving a library's collection goals.

f) Formula - prescribed model for assisting in equitable distribution of library funds.

g) Library materials - all items which make up the holdings of a library. These can include books, manuscripts, serials, government publications, recordings, microforms, pamphlets, maps, etc.

h) Monitoring - regular checking on the status and use of the allocations provided from the library materials budget.

i) Standing order - an order to a vendor or publisher to supply automatically as published all publications in a particular series or on a particular subject.

j) Test of effectiveness - any means used to examine the results of the allocation process and by which an evaluation is made.

k) Weighting - assigning a level of value or importance to a specified statistic, such as the number of full-time equivalency undergraduates.

2. GUIDELINES FOR THE ALLOCATION OF LIBRARY MATERIALS FUNDS

2.1 Principles.

2.1.1 Any method used should provide for an equitable distribution of available funds according to agreed-upon priorities.

2.1.2 Control should be within the library, with appropriate consultation within and outside the library.

2.1.3 The allocation method should be developed in conjunction with, or in close relationship to, a collection development policy statement.

2.1.4 The allocation method should be readily understandable to those who are responsible for the allocation of funds, to those who are responsible for the expenditure of such funds, and to those who must interpret the results to library users.

2.1.5 The allocation method should have some flexibility so that it can respond to changing circumstances or needs within the institution, to changes in the book market, or to take advantage of unexpected opportunities.

2.1.6 The allocation process should provide for both present needs and anticipated future needs, thus assisting in the planning process.

2.1.7 The allocation method used should be sufficiently objective so that it is not readily subject to political pressure or manipulation.

2.2 Factors to be considered in selecting an allocation method.

a) Whether there is now a formal budgeting process which may place constraints on, or limit the choices of, an allocation method.

b) Whether the type of accounting procedure in use may limit the options; e.g., whether there are encumbrances, whether unspent funds can be carried forward or transferred from one account to another.

c) Whether an institution is in a "steady state", in a period of growth, or in a period of reduction.

2.2 d) Whether the necessary data are available as required by existing formulas; e.g., use figures.

e) Whether there exists a formal or informal policy statement and/or statement of priorities.

2.3 Methods of allocating library materials funds.

It is probable that no one method is, or can be, used exclusively within a single institution and that a combination may be necessary. Many budgets provide specific sums of money for certain categories of material (e.g., monographs, serials, newspapers, microforms), for individual units of the library (e.g., a branch library, reference department), or for specific subject or language areas. Money may be allocated to library staff members, to academic departments, to individual faculty members, or to students. A specified number of volumes may be the basis for an allocation; e.g., as in the Voigt formula, and this will require translation into dollar equivalents.

2.3.1 Advantages and disadvantages of various methods:

a) By broad subject; e.g., humanities, social sciences.

Advantages: Allows flexibility.

Disadvantages: A small subject within the broader one may be overlooked or treated inequitably.

b) By specific subject; e.g., anthropology.

Advantages: It is easy to monitor progress in a particular category.

Disadvantages: Interdisciplinary materials cannot be assigned so specifically; specific items may not be identifiable in standing orders or approval plans.

c) By forms of material; e.g., monographs, serials, microform.

Advantages: Statistical data for library and government agencies is usually based on this type of information.

2.3.1 c) Disadvantages: The subject breakdown possibility is lost. Flexibility may also be lost.

d) To units within the library; e.g., reference department, branch.

Advantages: Enables unit to develop an appropriate collection based on user needs.

Disadvantages: Duplication of interdisciplinary materials will be required.

e) To academic department; e.g., philosophy, English.

Advantages: Faculty members are involved in the selection process.

Disadvantages: The library risks losing control of its funds and of the collection if it does not have a close working relationship with departments.

2.4 Allocation, Monitoring, Control.

All the individuals and groups mentioned below may be involved to some extent in all parts of the allocation process, but the most usual assignments of responsibility are as follows:

a) Allocation is done by:

-- Chief Librarian or other administrative officer

-- Collection Development Officer

-- Head of Acquisitions

-- Staff and/or administrative committee

-- Cooperative effort between library and faculty committee or departments.

b) Monitoring of expenditures is done by:

-- Collection Development Officer

-- Bibliographer

-- Acquisitions Librarian

-- Faculty or academic department

2.4 c) Evaluation of the allocation method is done by:

-- Collection Development Officer

-- Staff committee

-- Selection personnel

-- Users: students, staff, other users. This could involve direct or indirect input.

2.4.1 Test of effectiveness.

Testing the effectiveness of any method should be a regular or periodic operation. Each year's budget preparation should include a review and evaluation of the results of the preceding year's allocations. Methods for evaluation include the use of circulation figures, interlibrary loan statistics, comparison with bibliographies.

2.5 Materials covered by allocations.

All types of materials may be included in the allocation process: monographs, serials, microforms, documents, pamphlets, maps, AV materials.

2.6 Problem areas in determining allocations.

2.6.1 Standing orders, approval or blanket order plans. Coverage may be interdisciplinary, thus a subject breakdown is difficult. Also, the required budget amount may be difficult to determine in advance.

2.6.2 If there are separate budgets for serials, newspapers, microforms, etc., it may force rigidity on what should be a flexible process.

2.6.3 There is almost always a need for a discretionary fund to take advantage of opportunities or to give aid in a crisis.

2.6.4 The impact of new programs requiring start-up funds can put the budget out of balance if such funds were not sought in advance.

2.6.5 Duplication of certain categories of materials may be necessary or desirable. Special allowances have to be made for this.

2.6.6 Retrospective material may be needed but the availability of such materials and their actual costs may be hard to predict.

2.6.7 The quantity of publication in various subjects or languages may vary widely and must be taken into account in determining allocations.

2.6.8 Inflation factors must be taken into consideration. Not only is it difficult to predict what the real inflation rate will be, but also how it will differ between subjects or types of materials.

2.6.9 Gifts, especially unexpected or unsolicited, may fill the need for certain materials so that purchase is not needed. Budget flexibility to transfer funds from an area where they are not needed will help deal with this situation.

2.6.10 Special funds may have special requirements or limitations on their use. They may even be sufficient to wholly support certain areas of the collection. These must be taken into consideration when regular funds are allocated.

3. ELEMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALLOCATION MODELS

3.1 Objective factors.

3.1.1 External (publishing and book trade):

a) The rate and pattern of publishing in various subject areas, or for various types of materials.

b) Costs of books and other materials.

c) Differences in costs between various categories of materials.

d) Inflation.

3.1.2 Internal (library):

a) Size of the collection.

b) Rate of growth of the collection (by subject, department, etc.).

c) Use of the collection.

d) Unfilled patron needs.

e) Interlibrary borrowing and lending statistics.

3.1.3 Size and kind of user group:

a) Campus

-- Faculty size and faculty load

-- Student enrollment

-- Credit hours

-- Graduate programs

-- Degrees granted

b) Public library -- adults, young people, children

c) Special library -- employees, outsider users

d) School library -- students, faculty

3.2 Subjective factors.

a) Mission and goals of the institution.

b) Politics (campus, city, county, state, business, etc.).

c) Historical development of the collection.

d) Academic distinction of departments in college or university.

e) Extent of reliance of academic department or discipline on library materials.

3.3 Weighting of above factors.

There is no generally recognized standard for weighting the above factors. The weight given to a particular factor in a library will be determined by the goals and resources of the library, and will be tailored to the individual library. Many institutions determine their own weightings; e.g., enrollment in upper division units is worth two of lower division units. Others simply weigh all factors in a formula equally.

4. USING A FORMULA

4.1 Why use a formula?

A formula can provide for a logical and equitable distribution of available funds. It can also assist in creating a budget based on programs, priorities and goals of the institution. It can assist in making choices, so that choosing alternatives and priorities becomes an articulated rather than an unclear process.

4.2 What can a formula be used for?

It can be used for an initial allocation of funds, for a reallocation of funds, or to allocate supplementary funds to the base. Some of the formulas described in the appendix are only suitable for allocating funds among libraries, not within libraries; e.g., Washington Formula, Florida Formula.

4.3 Benefits of using a formula.

Once a suitable formula has been developed, funds can be allocated easily and quickly. Allocations can be justified on the basis of the formula and objectivity in the allocation process can be demonstrated. The formula itself can be reexamined periodically, if necessary.

4.4 Disadvantages of using a formula.

A formula may not be flexible enough to cover differing needs in various areas; e.g., absolute equity may not be desirable. It may not be able to handle sudden changes in fiscal circumstances, and the data necessary for the development of a formula may not be readily available; e.g., library's own book cost figures, circulation figures broken down by subject; or external data may be unavailable.

5. PUBLISHED FORMULAS

Formulas have been devised both to allocate funds among institutions; e.g., Washington formula, and within a single institution; e.g., McGrath formula. Some, such as the Kohut model, address a specific problem, in this case the balancing of serial and monographic purchases. Brief descriptions and citation to the full text of the following published formulas and allocation models are given in an Appendix:

Formulas.

ALA/ACRL Standards for College Libraries, Clapp-Jordan, Florida, McGrath, Voigt, Washington. (Note: The ALA/ACRL proposed standards for university libraries are still being drafted.)

Allocation Models.

Dillehay, Gold, Kohut, Pierce.

5.1 Problems not yet handled by any formula:

a) Weighting of various factors.

b) Retrospective acquisition rates.

c) Built-in recovery from lean budget years.

d) Recognition of existing collection adequacy.

e) Rates of literature obsolescence in various disciplines.

f) Intuition and knowledge based on experience; i.e., subjective judgment.

6. ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFICACY OF THE ALLOCATION PROCESS

Some possible methods are:

a) The rate and pattern of collection growth.

b) User comment and opinion.

c) Accreditation studies.

d) Comparison of the collection with others of recognized excellence.

e) Evaluation of the collection by comparison with standard bibliographies.

6. (Continued)

A collection development policy statement as discussed in the Guidelines for the formulation of collection development policies, Prelim. ed., March 1976*, can be a valuable tool with which to assess progress; i.e., were the funds allocated so that the collection is developing as planned? A discussion on the evaluation of collections with details of various methods can be found in Guidelines for the evaluation of library collections, Working Paper, July 1976*.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.

*Prepared by the Collection Development Committee of the Resources Section of RTSD/ALA.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY RELATED TO THE ALLOCATION OF LIBRARY BOOK FUNDS

Allen, Kenneth S. Current and Emerging Budgeting Techniques in Academic Libraries, Including a Critique of the Model Budget Analysis Program of the State of Washington. Seattle: University of Washington, 1972.

American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries. "Standards for College Libraries; Approved as Policy by the Board of Directors of the Association of College and Research Libraries, on July 3, 1975." College and Research Libraries News, IX (October, 1975), 277-9.

Bach, Harry. "Why Allocate?" Library Resources and Technical Services, VIII (Spring, 1964), 161-5.

Clapp, Verner W. and Robert T. Jordan. "Quantitative Criteria for Adequacy of Academic Library Collections." College and Research Libraries, XXVI (September, 1965), 371-80.

Dillehay, Bette. "Book Budget Allocation: Subjective or Objective Approach." Special Libraries, LXII (December, 1971), 504-14.

Gold, Steven D. "Allocating the Book Budget: an Economic Model." College and Research Libraries, XXXVI (September, 1975), 397-402.

Goyal, S. K. "Allocation of Library Funds to Different Departments of a University: an Operational Research Approach." College and Research Libraries, XXXIV (May, 1973), 219-22.

Headings, Bernice E. "The Formulation of a Book Budget Policy for Small College Libraries." Wilson Library Bulletin, XXVI (January, 1952), 389-93.

Kohut, Joseph J. "Allocating the Book Budget: a Model." College and Research Libraries, XXXV (May, 1974), 192-9.

Kohut, Joseph J. and John F. Walker. "Allocating the Book Budget: Equity and Economic Efficiency." College and Research Libraries, XXXVI (September, 1975), 403-10.

McGrath, William E. "An Allocation Formula Derived from a Factor Analysis of Academic Departments." College and Research Libraries, XXX (January, 1969), 51-62.

McGrath, William E. "A Pragmatic Book Allocation Formula for Academic and Public Libraries with a Test for its Effectiveness." Library Resources and Technical Services, XIX (Fall, 1975), 356-69.

Pierce, Thomas John. "The Economics of Library Acquisitions: a Book Budget Allocation Model for University Libraries." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1976.

Schad, Jasper G. "Allocating Book Funds: Control of Planning?" College and Research Libraries, XXXI (May, 1970), 155-9.

Voight, Melvin J. "Acquisition Rates in University Libraries." College and Research Libraries, XXXVI (July, 1975), 263-71.

GENERAL BACKGROUND
UCLA
4 pp.

November 28, 1973

DRAFT BACKGROUND PAPER ON BOOK FUND ALLOCATIONS

To answer the question, how should book monies be divided among different schools and departments and disciplines, by saying "equitably", is simply to beg the question. Equitably can only mean: "according to need, so far as possible". When we can no longer supply all the funds which everyone needs, the choice of who shall get less is made on the basis of who has less need. And this must be determined by how important or unimportant that marginal need is for accomplishing that portion of the institutional objectives which are the library's objectives. We come then to consider, in choosing what shall not be supported, what is the marginal utility in terms of benefit beyond which no support can be given. Whenever this sort of determination must be made, it involves an evaluation of benefits.

Writers on this topic have faced this issue with varying degrees of candor and success. Those, like Voigt(1) who derive a formula based on programs, are simply assuming that the volumes they assign to the program on the basis of "experience" meet a minimum level of benefit or utility. Others, such as Raffel and Shishko (2), might argue that patrons could be queried and that their responses would substitute for market demand. Still others, such as the state auditors (3) and Newhouse and Alexander (4) would look at circulation records to determine utility or a surrogate for market demand. In each case, benefit or marginal utility is based on different factors each of which seems less convincing than the voting with dollars which occurs in the free market. Some writers, such as McGrath (5) use a composite formula which takes into account various ways of quantifying benefit or marginal utility.

A number of problems, however, complicate the picture considerably. The primary problem is, whether or not an attempt at a model, whether it be considered mathematical or econometric, is a substantially more efficient system for determining the allocation of resources than the essentially subjective system

which has been used heretofore. In other words, assume that he subjective system is 75% efficient over-all. If the mathematical model is only 80% efficient, is that increase of 5% in accuracy worth the effort? Perhaps not. Yet one might justify the effort if it tended to reduce the range of inefficiency in allocations to individual units. For example, let us assume that under the subjective methods, one unit received 60% more than it should, and another, smaller unit received 50% less than it should. Let us assume that the other units received slightly under their proper shares, so that the allocations over-all, tended to be 75% accurate. Let us then assume that a model would have resulted in an 80% accurate distribution of funds over-all, but with no unit receiving more than 25% more or 25% less than what they should. One might conclude that the uniformity of variation under the model made it more attractive as a basis for decision.

This situation is further complicated by the inevitable retention from the distributive workings of any model of certain discretionary funds. Take, for example, the special Regents funds made available this year. With 3/7 ths of these funds held back for discretionary allocation there is clearly a very substantial mixing of discretionary and model determined choice here - it approaches 50%-50%. It is hard to see, in theory, whether shortcomings can be compensated for by this mix, or whether they will be compounded.

If we could once move past this initial problem, perhaps by assigning a maximum percentage of budget, or a maximum figure over which modelling could be abandoned, and where discretionary allocation would prevail, some other problems arise.

With regard to the construction of the model, care must be taken not to build in certain biases. For example, circulation figures, or even citations (McGrath, (5) and Brookes (6)) tend to have distinct biases. For circulation, the figures do not represent latent or unmet damand, but only what demand has been met. Marginal utility could be seriously distorted by looking only at a portion of a utility curve (plotting costs and benefits or consumed

units and utility), especially if the curve, if extenced, did not flatten immediately. In addition, insofar as citations are concerned, citations sources in professional schools and undergraduate libraries are not comparable with Ph.D. involved programs or departments.

With circulation and citation, approached from a retrospective viewpoint, insufficient account is taken of likely future use and decay, (Buckman(7) interalia). The problem is that benefit is computed in the short term (usually the statistics from one fiscal year), and thus neither future demand nor decay are taken into account.

A problem also exists with scatter (Brooker (6) and Buckman (7)). Different utility curves result from different scatter patterns. To calculate marginal utility, the pattern of scatter must be determined

These problems mentioned immediately above assume that benefits can be quantified and compared. They either assume e.g. that an adjusted circulation figure gives a basis for comparison, or that some other calculation must be made equating marginal utility to an accurately quantified benefit. An example of the latter case is the quantification of legal education by calculating differences in expected earnings ((8). This method of quantification of benefit might be applied to each component of legal education including the law library (according to Prof. Werner Hirsch).

Outside of this economic apporach, the dominating approach to resource allocation in the University library setting is the approach of political expediency, tempered by subjective judgments as to what University and library goals ought to be. In simplest terms, the approach of political expediency permits the substitution of the judgment of individuals and pressure groups for the professional judgment of the librarian applying economic analysis. The approach of the subjective values of the librarian allows the replacement of imperfectly adopted policy guidelines by the personal priorities of a librarian who is firmly convinced that those personal priorities are superior to those adopted by the more

cumbersome institutional mechanisms.

No matter what sort of formula is adopted for the allocation of book funds, it should have some sort of auditing system built in to determine its value as a device (one indication of how successful it is is the extent to which actual allocations conflict with the theory, e.g. what sort of systems are developed to circumvent it), and to adjust or completely redesign it, or perhaps abandon it. The auditing of a subjective allocation is usually more difficult because objectives need not be so clearly stated. Although accountability is therefore diminished, this may become a strong argument for abandoning the subjective allocation and moving more toward the model.

Fred Smith
UCLA Law Librarian

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MANAGEMENT STUDIES
Duane E. Webster, Director

ARL's Collection Analysis Project

The Office of University Library Management Studies (OMS) of the Association of Research Libraries has designed a procedure for the analysis of collection, acquisition, retention and preservation practices at university research libraries. Three ARL member libraries will be engaged to test and evaluate this procedure and contribute to its development. These pilot tests will be supported by a grant from the Mellon Foundation.

There are two major stages of the project. The first includes a general overview of environmental pressures for change, including trends in resource sharing, scholarly publishing and higher education economics. Library and university goals and objectives are also examined in this initial stage, and a profile of collections is compiled that includes an historical description of collection strengths and weaknesses.

The second stage of the analysis is a more detailed examination of the key elements in the collections function. For example, one examination looks at the way collection funds are allocated and considers how decisions are made, who makes them, and what critical factors influence those decisions, such as historical precedent, political influence, and university program emphasis. The second stage also looks at the distribution of resources in terms of academic or subject units, forms of materials, and current vs. retrospective materials. The actual selection process is reviewed in terms of characterizing how selections are made; examining the roles of bibliographers, faculty and public service librarians; investigating the availability and use of collections policies; and examining the methods and materials used for selection.

Operating procedures also will receive some attention including a review of the way the collection development functions are organized and staffed; the administrative, supervisory, and coordinating responsibilities and how they are distributed; some of the functional costs; and the key relationships of the collection development staff within the library and with the teaching faculty.

The systematic study of the use of collections and user behavior patterns is also important. Techniques are provided to enable participating libraries to secure information on current and potential user needs, as well as to determine the success of collections in meeting these needs. The next detailed analysis is an investigation of resource sharing practices in terms of what is being done, the costs and value of such activities, and the probable impact of evolving resource sharing programs, on library collections. The final analysis examines preservation practices.

The OMS provides a series of resources to assist libraries in carrying out the project. A manual provides the procedural and conceptual frameworks for the

1527
New Hampshire
Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(202) 232-8656 or 2466

operation of the study. In addition, it discusses the issues involved in the collections function and presents a prescribed analytical approach. The manual has been prepared to be adaptable to a range of local differences among libraries, and each library will want to make specific adaptions as the study proceeds. One of the primary intentions of the manual is to eliminate the need for the study team to expend large amounts of time on project design so that it might focus on the actual review and analysis of issues and the development of recommendations for change.

In addition to the manual, the OMS has developed supplementary written materials intended to assist in carrying out specific project tasks. Included are data-gathering instruments such as user surveys, interview guides, formats for analyzing and displaying data, and working papers dealing with such issues as: preparing the interim report; preparing the final report; and group decision-making.

Finally, the OMS provides direct assistance to the study team during the project, mainly through a series of on-site training sessions where the OMS staff facilitates the definition and resolution of problems and the planning for the next study phases. The OMS staff also are available for other consultations with the study team either via telephone or, if necessary, in person.

The Collection Analysis Project should result in a distributed understanding of the issues related to collection development and should influence those critical groups on a university campus that have an impact on collection activities. It is also expected that local application of the project will result in documentation for use in budget presentations and a plan of action for future development of the library's collection activity.

September 23, 1977

USE OF FORMULA
Colorado State
10 pp.

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
November 10, 1975

BOOK FUND ALLOCATION FORMULA

The purpose of the Book Fund Allocation is to assure that the collections of the University Libraries are developed and strengthened in a rational and balanced fashion. The formula reflects the resource requirements of the teaching and research programs of the institution insofar as it is possible to identify and quantify their relative importance.

Book allocations at C.S.U. are developed according to the broad subject divisions of Biomedical Sciences; Business/Economics; Engineering Sciences; Forestry and Agricultural Sciences; Humanities; Physical Sciences; and Social Sciences. The precise form in which the information is packaged is irrelevant for the most part. Allocation by form of materials, therefore, is made only when it presents unique selection or administrative problems, for example reference works.

In order to determine the relative weights of the teaching/research programs, as many as forty-one criteria have been considered for inclusion in the allocation formula. After considerable review and deliberation, thirteen criteria were ultimately selected and assigned numerical weights. Ten of the criteria relate directly to teaching and research, that is: 1) number of credits--lower division; 2) number of credits--upper division; 3) number of credits--graduate; 4) number of courses--lower division; 5) number of courses--upper division; 6) number of courses--graduate; 7) number of majors--undergraduate; 8) the number of majors--masters; 9) number of majors--Ph.D. etc.; 10) the number of faculty members. The remaining three criteria are associated with the realities of the publishing world, that is: 11) the number of faculty publications; 12) the cost of published books; and 13) the cost of published serials.

Assigning numerical weights to each criterion is an attempt to convey the relative institutional requirement for library materials plus availability and costs. The final book allocation formula, then, is comprised of thirteen weighted criteria as applied to the actual dollars available in the acquisitions appropriation for the following fiscal year.

In these instances, the formula is flexible. It was conceived and developed over a considerable period of time by a professional task force. It is continually reviewed. It is ultimately endorsed by the Libraries staff, Library Council, and the University administration.

LWA/st

COLUMN CRITERIA AND SOURCES OF DATA

COLUMN #1 Enrollment X credit (lower div.)
#2 Enrollment X credit (upper div.)
#3 Enrollment X credit (graduate)

This trio of columns is composed of enrollment figures for the entire academic year, all courses and all sections, figured by department and summarized into percentages.

SOURCE: CSU computerized data base of demographic enrollment information to be generated as soon as possible. It may be necessary to write a computer program to manipulate data as we need it. Until this is done, data may have to be gathered from Deans and/or Department Heads and compiled by hand. The primary purpose of this column is to capture Credit Hours Actually Taught.

COLUMN #4 Courses (lower division)
#5 Courses (upper division)
#6 Courses (graduate)

All courses listed as offered at Colorado State University.

SOURCE: CSU General Catalog. Each course is counted once, totaled by department and plugged into the formula as a percentage of the total.

COLUMN #7 Majors (undergraduate)
#8 Majors (Masters)
#9 Majors (Ph.D. etc.)

Majors at the various levels, tallied by department and converted to percentages.

SOURCE: Winter Quarter Enrollment Statistics. CSU Office of Admissions and Records.

COLUMN #10 Faculty

All CSU academic faculty and all administrative faculty that are affiliated with a teaching department.

SOURCE: CSU Directory.

COLUMN #11 Research

This column reflects potential library use generated by departmental involvement in research. The sources used for this data are three in number for maximum fairness to all departments.

SOURCES:

a. Faculty publications as listed in the forthcoming compilation.
b. FIC grants as listed by the Graduate School.
c. Numerical count of sponsored research, i.e. contracts and grants. This is compiled by counting each investigator by department for

each contract or grant, taken from monthly reports from the Office of Contracts and Grants.

COLUMN #12 Cost of Published Books

As approved by the Library Council, the same percentage figures were used for the 1975-1976 budget allocations as were used for the 1974-1975 allocations. These percentages were based on data found in the Richard Abel & Company's 1973 Book Prices; an International Survey and Forecast. This survey, the last one made by the now defunct Abel Company, was based on book prices for 1972 and the first six months of 1973.

COLUMN #13 Cost of Purchased Serials

As approved by the Library Council, the budget allocations figures for the 1975-1976 fiscal year are the same as those for the 1974-1975 fiscal year. These percentages were calculated from statistics which appear annually in the July issue of the Library Journal. The statistics are the result of surveys conducted by Dr. Brown of the University of Illinois.

COLUMN #14 TOTALS

SOURCE: Data in all other columns of the formula. Total points for each subject field (columns left to right) figured as a percentage of the whole to give the final figure for allocation of funds for collection development.

Methodology for collecting the bulk of the internal data consists of having serial lists by funds generated by the computer at or near the end of the fiscal year, then dividing the total number of titles in each subject area into the total amount charged to such subject area for subscription renewals. This gives the average price for serials for that particular subject fund which is converted to a percentage of the total serials renewal expense.

LWA/st
12/3/75

OFFICE MEMO

TO: Dr. LeMoyne W. Anderson Date March 23, 1976

FROM: Hwa-Wei Lee

SUBJECT: The 1976-77 Books/Serials Allocation Formula

REMARKS:

The attached 1976-77 Books/Serials Allocation Formula is submitted to you for approval. Included are three memorandums describing the ways in which new data were gathered for the formula. All but one of the 13 columns in the 1976-77 formula have been revised and updated. The column that remains unchanged is "Faculty Publications". This is due to the fact that there is no new information on faculty publications available which can be easily analyzed and tabulated for use.

Because there were considerable changes in enrollments, courses, majors, faculty, and costs of books and serials in 1975, the final percentage points for 1976-77 in three subject areas show large fluctuations in comparison with their corresponding percentage points in 1975-76. These subject areas are:

Subject Area	1975-76	1976-77	Difference
Business and Economics	7.50	11.66	up 4.16
Humanities	12.40	10.23	down 2.17
Social Sciences	19.30	16.59	down 2.71

Upon reviewing the percentage points in the 1976-77 formula, it was felt by members of the Committee on Collection Development that any drastic change in percentage point from one year to another such as in the cases of Business and Economics, Humanities, and Social Sciences is undesirable. It will be particularly difficult for those subject areas having a large reduction in allocation to make the necessary adjustment without a buffer period.

Instead of recommending the adoption of the 1976-77 percentage points as they are, the committee unanimously approved the recommendation made by Ms. Antoinette L. Lueck to use the "Data Smoothing Technique" in order to obtain a new set of percentage points by averaging out the percentage points for 1976-77 with the percentage points of the two preceding years.

Having participated in the committee's deliberation, I fully support the recommendation to use the three-year average percentage points as the percentage points for the 1976-77 allocation.

Attached

XC: Mr. James Deay and Members of CLOD

OFFICE MEMO

TO: Hwa-Wei Lee, Associate Director

Date April 21, 1976

FROM: L. W. Anderson, Director of Libraries

SUBJECT: Books/Serials Allocation Formula, 1976/77

REMARKS:

As I indicated to you in an earlier memorandum (April 5, 1976), the matter of the Allocation Formula was scheduled for review by the Library Council.

At the last meeting of the L.C., it was voted (6-1) to endorse the recommendation of the Committee on Collection Development and to recommend the continuation of utilizing the data smoothing technique next year.

After further reviewing all input on the matter, I concur with the recommendation of the Committee on Collection Development, also. It is in order, therefore, to apply the Books/Serials Allocation Formula to the 1976/77 budget as soon as the monies are made available.

L. W. Anderson

LWA/st

xc: Deay

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

TO: Libraries Staff DATE: January 21, 1974

FROM: Director of Libraries

SUBJECT: Book Fund Allocation and Processing

I. POLICY

After the University Operating Budget is determined annually in the spring, the Books, Serials and Binding funds are established for the forthcoming fiscal year. Upon endorsement of the Library Council, the Libraries allocates book funds to support the teaching, research, and service activities of the University as follows:

A. Funds available for books are distributed according to a pre-determined formula into several categories including: Humanities, Social Sciences, Physical Sciences, Forestry and Agricultural Sciences, Biomedical Sciences, Engineering Sciences, Business and Economics, and Reference;

B. A General Fund is also provided for the purchase of publications which cross departmental lines and defy compartmentalization as well as titles which are not associated with an organized discipline;

C. In addition, special funds may be allocated at the discretion of the Director of Libraries;

D. Funds for non-book materials and services may be allocated separately. These may include such categories as records and tapes; maps; binding; and other special bibliographical services.

II. PROCEDURES

A. Faculty Recommendations

1. In suggesting a title for the Libraries' collections, a faculty member is required to include complete bibliographical information on an appropriate recommendation card, either typed or printed.

2. The card is forwarded by a faculty member to the Identification Department via the appropriate subject librarian.

3. The Identification Department is responsible for checking the recommended titles against the holdings of the Libraries' collections.

4. In the event a title is in the card catalog, or is on order, the order recommendation card is returned to the subject librarian with the call number or appropriate information.

B. Librarian Recommendations

1. Basic book selection of current in-print scholarly publications is accomplished through the announcements received regularly from the vendors.

(over)

2. The announcements are sorted and distributed to the subject librarians for their examination and/or examination by the faculty. Titles recommended for order are signed by the subject librarians and submitted to the Identification Department for processing.

3. All other recommendations are submitted to the Identification Department on order recommendation cards, signed by a subject librarian.

C. General Directions

1. Subject librarians work closely with the Acquisitions Librarian, the individual faculty member, and, whenever appropriate, the Library Council representative or department head in distributing funds within the Book allocations.

2. In order to facilitate this control, the subject librarian is sent a monthly book fund report indicating the allotments, the expenditures, the encumbrances, and the overdrafts or free balances.

3. The Preparations Librarian notifies the subject librarian when a recommended title has been cataloged. It is the subject librarian's responsibility to forward the notification slip to the librarian or faculty member who made the original recommendation.

4. In cases where differences of opinion about appropriate funds arise among librarians, academic department heads, and faculty, the chief bibliographer renders the final decisions.

LWA/LKR:st

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

(Book/Serials Allocation Formula)

		1			2			3			4			5		
YEAR	S U B J E C T	Enrollment x credit (lower div.)			Enrollment x credit (upper div.)			Enrollment x credit (graduate)			Courses (lower div.)			Courses (upper div.)		
		%	wt.	pts.	%	wt.	pts.	%	wt.	pts.	%	wt.	pts.	%	wt.	pts.
75-76	Biomedical Sciences	4.00	1	4.00	9.00	2	18.00	37.70	8	301.60	3.60	1	3.60	6.10	2	12.20
76-77		2.05		2.05	9.2[illegible]		18.4[illegible]	26.49		211.92	4.31		4.31	9.65		19.30
77-78		8.60		8.60	9.10		18.20	34.20		273.60	1.60		1.60	5.93		11.86
75-76	Business & Economics	9.90	1	9.90	14.0[illegible]	2	28.00	5.60	8	44.8	6.50	1	6.50	10.40	2	20.80
76-77		8.85		8.85	14.[illegible]		28.16	8.70		69.6	6.98		6.98	10.86		21.72
77-78		10.90		10.90	17.[illegible]		34.80	6.80		54.4	4.66		4.66	7.52		15.04
75-76	Engineering Sciences	1.80	1	1.80	5.80	2	11.60	13.50	8	108.00	3.20	1	3.20	8.40	2	16.80
76-77		2.17		2.17	5.68		11.36	11.19		89.52	3.80		3.80	7.19		14.38
77-78		3.00		3.00	6.30		12.60	14.90		119.20	2.58		2.58	6.99		13.98
75-76	Forestry & Agriculture	12.20	1	12.20	24.[illegible]	2	49.60	15.80	8	126.40	12.60	1	12.60	15.80	2	31.60
76-77		13.55		13.55	18.3[illegible]		36.66	20.88		167.04	11.46		11.46	14.58		29.16
77-78		6.20		6.20	15.50		31.00	11.30		90.40	8.34		8.34	13.79		27.58
75-76	Humanities	23.90	1	23.90	13.40	2	27.20	4.70	8	37.60	29.00	1	29.00	22.90	2	45.80
76-77		22.27		22.27	16.75		33.50	5.91		47.28	29.55		29.55	20.68		41.36
77-78		19.20		19.20	13.90		27.80	3.80		30.40	26.75		26.75	18.71		37.42
75-76	Physical Sciences	23.60	1	23.60	8.70	2	17.40	10.00	8	80.00	19.70	1	19.70	12.80	2	25.60
76-77		27.99		27.99	13.38		27.76	11.54		92.32	21.89		21.89	13.54		27.08
77-78		28.80		28.80	12.90		25.80	12.90		103.20	22.21		22.21	14.51		29.02
75-76	Social Sciences	24.50	1	24.50	24.30	2	48.60	12.60	8	100.80	25.00	1	25.00	23.30	2	46.60
76-77		23.12		23.12	22.54		45.08	15.29		122.32	21.99		21.99	23.50		47.00
77-78		23.30		23.30	24.70		49.40	16.00		128.00	33.87		33.87	32.55		65.10
	TOTALS	100.00			99.80			99.99			100.01			100.00		

(cont. next page)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES (BOOK/SERIALS ALLOCATION FORMULA)

6			7			8			9			10			11			12		
Courses (graduate)			Majors (undergrad.)			Majors (Masters)			Majors (Ph.D. etc.)			Faculty			Research			Cost of Published Books		
%	wt.	pts.	%	wt.	pts.	%	wt.	pts.	%	wt.	pts.	%	wt.	pts.	%	wt.	pts.	%	wt.	pts.
16.50	8	132.00	11.20	1	11.20	10.00	5	50.00	19.00	8	152.00	16.00	6	96.00	15.80	8	126.40	7.50	10	75.00
16.86		134.88	10.78		10.78	18.84		94.20	22.18		177.44	14.08		84.48	15.80		126.40	10.40		104.00
14.19		113.52	8.48		8.48	14.95		74.75	19.35		154.80	16.00		96.00	15.90		127.20	10.73		107.30
7.40	8	59.20	11.40	1	11.40	8.50	5	42.50	3.30	8	26.40	8.30	6	49.80	5.10	8	40.80	9.40	10	94.00
9.54		76.32	13.91		13.91	10.76		53.80	3.64		29.12	8.40		50.40	5.10		40.80	16.76		167.60
4.83		38.64	15.05		15.05	8.18		40.90	3.43		27.44	9.00		54.00	5.45		43.60	16.67		166.70
15.50	8	124.00	5.80	1	5.80	10.00	5	50.00	22.00	8	176.00	9.90	6	59.40	21.40	8	171.20	5.60	10	56.00
12.61		100.88	7.84		7.84	14.07		70.35	20.36		162.88	10.77		64.62	21.40		171.20	6.71		67.10
12.09		96.72	7.05		7.05	11.20		56.00	22.37		178.96	13.00		78.00	39.76		318.10	6.18		61.80
14.60	8	116.80	22.30	1	22.30	12.80	5	64.00	21.70	8	173.60	22.00	6	132.00	28.80	8	230.40	3.30	10	33.00
16.88		135.04	21.66		21.66	15.41		77.05	23.37		186.96	18.49		110.94	28.80		230.40	2.34		23.40
14.77		118.16	22.33		22.33	12.06		60.30	24.56		196.48	17.00		102.00	13.80		110.40	2.70		27.00
10.20	8	81.60	16.90	1	16.90	21.80	5	109.00	0.00	8	0.00	14.00	6	84.00	7.70	8	61.60	25.50	10	255.00
10.20		81.60	14.70		14.70	7.01		35.05	0.00		0.00	15.27		91.62	7.70		61.60	20.78		207.80
10.09		80.72	14.54		14.54	11.04		55.20	0.00		0.00	14.00		84.00	5.14		41.12	24.15		241.50
16.70	8	133.60	10.20	1	10.20	9.90	5	49.50	23.70	8	189.60	12.50	6	75.00	15.20	8	121.60	11.50	10	115.00
14.10		112.80	10.51		10.51	9.93		49.65	22.91		183.28	15.10		90.60	15.20		121.60	14.72		147.20
15.24		121.92	9.01		9.01	8.43		42.15	18.31		146.48	14.00		84.00	13.25		106.00	12.81		128.10
18.80	8	150.40	22.20	1	22.20	27.10	5	135.50	10.40	8	83.20	17.30	6	103.80	5.70	8	45.60	35.30	10	353.00
19.79		158.32	20.60		20.60	23.97		119.85	7.64		61.12	17.90		107.40	5.70		45.60	28.47		284.70
28.80		230.40	23.64		23.64	34.15		170.75	11.97		95.76	17.00		102.00	6.60		52.80	26.76		267.60
100.01			100.00			100.01			99.99			100.00			99.99			100.00		

(cont. next page)

13			14		15	16	17	18
Cost of Purchased Serials			TOTALS					
%	wt.	pts.	Points	%	1975 - 76 %	1976 - 77 %	1977 - 78 %	Average of 1975-76, 1976-77, 1977-78 %
13.70 17.24 16.93	10	137.00 172.40 169.30	1119.00 1116.64 1038.01	16.00 16.58 16.74	16.0	16.58	16.74	16.44
9.20 25.08 25.76	10	92.00 250.80 257.60	526.10 816.06 720.13	7.50 11.66 11.61	7.5	11.66	11.61	10.26
11.30 15.91 15.64	10	113.00 159.10 156.40	896.80 925.50 788.29	12.90 13.22 12.71	12.9	13.22	12.71	12.94
6.00 9.01 8.60	10	60.00 90.10 86.00	1061.50 1133.42 775.69	15.30 16.19 12.51	15.3	16.19	12.51	14.67
9.40 5.00 5.19	10	94.00 50.00 51.90	865.60 716.33 669.43	12.40 10.23 10.79	12.4	10.23	10.79	11.40
29.70 17.38 17.22	10	297.00 173.80 172.20	1157.80 1086.48 912.89	16.60 15.52 14.72	16.6	15.52	14.72	15.61
20.70 10.40 10.64	10	207.00 104.00 106.40	1346.20 1161.10 1296.22	19.30 16.59 20.90	19.3	16.59	20.90	18.93
99.98				99.98				

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS
The University Library

Changes in Staff and Programs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Committee/ Department/ Program	Total academic staff	Projected Change in Staff	MA or MS	PhD	Other
American Studies	4.0	-0-	X	-	
Anthropology	15.0	-0-	X	X	
Art	17.0	2.0	X	-	New faculty in Oriental Art and in Sculpture
Bacteriology	10.0	1.0	X	-	
Botany	24.0	-0-	X	X	
Chemistry	37.0	-0-	X	X	
Classics	4.0	-0-	X	-	
Comparative Literature	4.0	-0-	-	-	
Dramatic Art	11.0	-0-	X	X	
East Asian Studies	12.0	1.0	-	-	
Economics	18.0	2.0	X	X	MA specialization in "applied economics"
Education	24.5	-0-	X	-	
English	29.0	(2.0)	X	X	MAT proposed for June 1977
French	14.0	-0-	X	X	
Geography	9.0	-0-	X	X	New joint faculty appointment with Nutrition
Geology	12.0	-0-	X	X	
German	9.0	1.0	X	X	
History	30.0	-0-	X	X	
Italian	4.0	-0-	-	-	
Linguistics	2.17	-0-	X	-	
Mathematics	40.0	1.0	X	X	
Military Science	6.0	1.0	-	-	
Music	9.0	-0-	X	-	
Philosophy	10.0	1.0	X	X	
Physical Education	24.0	-0-	X	-	
Physics	23.0	1.0	X	X	
Political Science	22.5	3.0	X	X	
Portuguese	-0-	-0-	-	-	
Psychology	21.5	1.0	X	X	
Religious Studies	2.67	0.5	-	-	
Rhetoric	9.0	-0-	X	-	
Russian	5.5	0.5	X	-	
Sociology	14.0	-0-	X	X	
Spanish	14.0	-0-	X	X	
Zoology	18.0	1.0	X	X	

STATISTICS-CRITERIA
UC Davis
2 pp.

University of California, Davis
The University Library

Courses offered

	Total Courses 1975/76	Courses offered but not listed in 1975/76 General Catalog			New Courses, 1976/77		
		Lower	Upper	Graduate	Lower	Upper	Graduate
American Studies	12	3	1	-0-	-0-	1	2
Anthropology	90	-0-	2	-0-	-0-	6	-0-
Art	70	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	5	-0-
Bacteriology	27	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1
Botany	65	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	3	-0-
Chemistry	33	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	-0-	-0-
Classics	53	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Comparative Literature	28	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Dramatic Art	47	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
East Asian Studies	50	-0-	-0-	-0-	2	2	1
Economics	71	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Education	55	-0-	-0-	9	-0-	-0-	2
English	114	1	3	-0-	-0-	1	1
French	88	1	-0-	-0-	1	-0-	-0-
Geography	36	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	-0-
Geology	58	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
German	78	1	1	1	2	2	3
History	139	1	2	1	2	3	1
Italian	23	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Linguistics	29	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	1
Mathematics	90	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	-0-
Military Science	14	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Music	49	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Philosophy	58	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Physical Education	40	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Physics	45	-0-	2	-0-	3	2	-0-
Political Science	102	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	2	9
Portuguese	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Psychology	61	-0-	1	-0-	4	4	1
Religious Studies	21	-0-	-0-	-0-	3	3	-0-
Rhetoric	38	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Russian	49	-0-	-0-	2	-0-	1	-0-
Sociology	63	1	1	1	-0-	1	1
Spanish	81	-0-	1	-0-	-0-	-0-	2
Zoology	59	-0-	1	1	-0-	6	2

STATISTICS-CRITERIA
Univ. of Washington
21 pp.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Allocation background info

Page	Contents
1	Ranked by faculty F.T.E.
2	"
3	Ranked by majors, graduate program
4	"
5	Ranked by majors, undergraduate program
6	"
7	Ranked by materials budget
8	"
9	Ranked by monograph budget/by serial renewal budget
10	"
11	BNA monograph publishing
12	Ranked according to "adequacy" of monograph budget
13	Monograph publishing plus serial renewals
14	Ranked by "adequacy" of present materials budget
15	Ranked by external research
16	"
17	Random comparisons

Peter Stevens
Acquisitions 6 May 1977

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Ranked by faculty FTE

Program	FTE Faculty	Materials Budget	Materials Budget Rank
1. Engineering	160.15	124,978	1
2. Sciences (SRR)	106.76	120,342	2
3. Business Administration	86.42	49,[illegible]35	8
4. Education	66.38	15,800	27
5. English	57.50	26,245	20
6. Mathematics	55.40	25,588	21
7. Music	50.92	34,530	15
8. Architecture	48.95	17,422	24
9. Art	45.50	30,734	16
10. Physics/Astronomy	45.25	35,542	14
11. Pharmacy/Chemistry	44.07	87,167	3
12. Fisheries/Oceanography	38.55	30,500	17
13. Social Work	36.67	7,854	39
14. Psychology	36.15	10,082	36
15. Communications/Speech	34.25	2,267	46
16. Forest Resources	32.87	16,547	25
17. History	32.50	67,901	5
18. Political Science	31.53	37,771	13
19. Economics	26.59	9,825	37
20. Anthropology	25.00	19,194	23
21. Sociology	24.00	11,526	34
22. Romance Languages	23.33	29,435	18
23. Drama	18.40	6,035	42
24. Asian L & L	17.00	53,403	7

Program	FTE Faculty	Materials Budget	Materials Budget Rank
25. Philosophy	14.00	14,041	29
26. Germanics	13.50	24,729	22
27. ICFAS	13.00		
28. Geography	11.00	13,566	31
29. Librarianship	11.00	12,010	33
30. Slavic L & L	11.00	44,385	9
31. Classics	8.67	16,355	26
32. Near East	6.33	13,806	30
33. Linguistics	5.67		
34. Scandinavian L & L	5.51	7,475	40
35. Comparative Literature	1.50		
36. Women's Studies	1.00		
37. Society & Justice	0.75		
38. American Indian	0.50		
	1,247.57	1,016,713	

Ranked by enrollment by majors

Graduate Program	Enrollment	Materials Budget	Materials Budget Rank
1. Education	866	15,800	27
2. Engineering	699	124,978	1
3. Business	543	49,655	8
4. Sciences	392	120,342	2
5. Physics/Astronomy	355	35,542	14
6. Fish/Oceanography	311	30,500	17
7. Social Work	298	7,854	39
8. Architecture	273	17,422	24
9. Political Science/P.A.	244	37,771	13
10. Forest Resources	231	16,547	25
11. Communications	203	2,267	46
12. English	177	26,245	20
13. Math	174	25,588	21
14. Librarianship	147	12,010	33
15. Pharmacy/Chemistry	136	87,167	3
16. Psychology	130	10,082	36
17. Art	127	30,734	16
18. Music	125	34,530	15
19. Economics	113	9,825	37
20. History	105	67,901	5
21. Sociology	89	11,526	34
22. Anthropology	86	19,194	23
23. Romance Languages	71	29,435	18
24. Asian Language & Literature	64	53,403	7
25. Geography	57	13,566	31

Graduate Program	Enrollment	Materials Budget	Materials Budget Rank
26. Comparative Literature	51		
27. Slavic	34	44,385	9
28. Germanic	33	24,729	22
29. Drama	31	6,035	42
30. Linguistics	30		
31. Philosophy	29	14,041	29
32. Scandinavian	20	7,475	40
33. Near East	19	13,806	30
34. Classics	15	16,355	26
35. South Asia	4	6,575	41

Ranked by enrollment by majors

Undergrad Program	Enrollment	Materials Budget	Materials Budget Rank
Pre major	7,513		
1. Engineering	2,677	124,978	1
2. Business	2,318	49,655	8
3. Sciences	(1,319)	120,342	2
4. Psychology	854	10,082	36
5. Art	850	30,734	16
6. Forest Resources	594	16,547	25
7. English	579	26,245	20
8. Communications/Speech	553	2,257	46
9. Education	547	15,800	27
10. Pharmacy/Chemistry	536	87,167	3
11. Architecture	533	17,427	24
12. Fisheries/Oceanography	526	30,500	17
13. Physics/Astronomy	526	35,542	14
14. Political Science/P.A.	362	37,771	13
15. History	338	67,901	5
16. Economics	327	9,825	37
17. Music	296	34,530	15
18. Math	262	25,588	21
19. Drama	229	6,035	42
20. Sociology	219	11,526	34
21. Social Work	202	7,854	39
22. Society & Justice	160		
23. General Studies	141		
24. Anthropology	124	19,194	23

Undergrad Program	Enrollment	Materials Budget	Materials Budget Rank
25. Romance Languages	115	29,435	18
26. Geography	101	13,566	31
27. Philosophy	83	14,041	29
28. Asian L & L	81	53,403	7
29. Slavic L & L	71	44,385	9
30. Germanic	48	24,729	22
31. Scandinavian	30	7,475	40
32. Classics	27	16,355	26
33. Comparative Religion	26	8,805	38
34. Comparative Literature	23		
35. Linguistics	13		
36. Near East	12	13,806	30
37. ICFAS	7		
38. South Asia	3	6,575	41

Ranked by materials budget
(Monographs and serials)

Program		Materials Budget	Faculty F.T.E. Rank	Graduate Enrollment Rank	Undergrad Enrollment Rank
1. Engineering	D	124,978	1	2	1
2. Sciences (SRR)	D	120,342	2	4	3
3. Pharmacy/Chemistry	D	87,167	11	15	10
4. Undergrad	B	85,400			
5. History	D	67,901	17	20	15
6. Reference		55,212			
7. Asian L & L	M	53,403	24	24	28
8. Business Administration	D	49,655	3	3	2
9. Slavic L & L	D	44,385	30	27	29
10. Documents		41,707			
11. General Library		40,163			
12. Replacements		38,780			
13. Political Science	D	37,771	18	9	14
14. Physics/Astronomy	D	35,542	10	5	13
15. Music	D	34,530	7	18	17
16. Art	D	30,734	9	17	5
17. Fisheries/Oceanography	D	30,500	12	6	12
18. Romance Languages	D	29,435	22	23	25
19. Newspaper		27,560			
20. English	D	26,245	5	12	7
21. Mathematics	D	25,588	6	13	18
22. Germanics	D	24,729	26	28	30
23. Anthropology	D	19,194	20	22	24

24.	Architecture	M	17,422	8	8	11
25.	Forest Resources	D	16,547	16	10	6
26.	Classics	D	16,355	31	34	32
27.	Education	D	15,800	4	1	9
28.	Friday Harbor		14,690			
29.	Philosophy	D	14,041	25	31	27
30.	Near East	M	13,806	32	33	36
31.	Geography	D	13,566	28	25	26
32.	Northwest		12,074			
33.	Librarianship	M	12,010	29	14	
34.	Sociology	D	11,526	21	21	20
35.	Periodicals		10,774			
36.	Psychology	D	10,082	14	16	4
37.	Economics	D	9,825	19	19	16
38.	Religion	B	8,805			
39.	Social Work	M	7,854	13	7	21
40.	Scandinavian L & L	D	7,475	34	32	31
41.	South Asia	M	6,575		35	38
42.	Drama	D	6,035	23	29	19
43.	Exchanges		5,367			
44.	Curriculum Center		4,181			
45.	Special Collections		3,275			
46.	Communications	D	2,267	15	11	8
47.	Maps		1,183			
48.	Interlibrary loan xerox		1,000			
			1,373,456			

Ranked by monograph budget

1.	Undergrad	39,585
2.	History	39,450
3.	Replacements	38,780
4.	Science Reading Room	24,615
5.	Political Science	22,555
6.	General Library	22,224
7.	East Asia	21,610
8.	Engineering	20,260
9.	Multiple Reserve	19,635
10.	Art	18,625
11.	Slavic	17,700
12.	English	16,490
13.	Documents	15,030
14.	Business Administration	13,560
15.	Music	13,515
16.	German	13,230
17.	Chemistry/Pharmacy	11,570
18.	Reference	11,310
19.	French	10,370
20.	Education	10,010
21.	Near East	9,985
22.	Architecture	9,750
23.	AV Media	9,005
24.	Slavic Exchange	8,810
25.	Philosophy	7,240
26.	Fisheries/Oceanography	6,800
27.	Spanish	6,780
28.	Northwest	6,715

Ranked by serial renewal budget

1.	Engineering	105,299
2.	Science Reading Room	95,632
3.	Chemistry/Pharmacy	76,048
4.	Reference	45,945
5.	Business Administration	35,588
6.	Central Serial	32,772
7.	History	31,392
8.	East Asia	30,887
9.	Physics/Astronomy	30,483
10.	Documents	25,987
11.	Fisheries/Oceanography	23,715
12.	Newspapers	21,174
13.	Mathematics	19,541
14.	General Library	17,580
15.	Political Science	15,191
16.	Music	15,173
17.	Undergrad	14,746
18.	Friday Harbor	12,293
19.	Art	12,097
20.	Forest Resources	11,834
21.	German	11,499
22.	Classics	10,455
23.	English	9,879
24.	Slavic	9,710
25.	Anthropology	9,509
26.	Geography	9,319
27.	Periodicals	8,765
28.	Slavic Exchanges	7,640
29.	Architecture	7,626
30.	Philosophy	6,901

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

29.	Anthropology	6,550
30.	Sociology	6,515
31.	Classics	5,900
32.	Psychology	5,820
33.	Scandinavian	5,500
34.	Economics	5,485
35.	Physics/Astronomy	5,410
36.	Religion	4,920
37.	Newspapers	4,890
38.	Social Work	4,860
39.	Forest Resources	4,700
40.	South Asia	4,670
41.	Music Records	4,485
42.	Mathematics	4,390
43.	Librarianship	4,245
44.	Geography	4,225
45.	Desiderata	4,100
46.	Drama	3,580
47.	Exchanges	3,560
48.	Special Collections	3,275
49.	Curriculum	2,780
50.	Italian	2,060
51.	Friday Harbor	2,055
52.	Periodicals	1,850
53.	Communication	1,500
54.	Other Languages	1,215
55.	Maps	1,165
56.	Contemporary Issues	1,070

31.	Education	5,760
32.	Northwest	5,210
33.	Economics	4,858
34.	Friday Harbor	4,854
35.	Sociology	4,511
36.	Librarianship	4,483
37.	Psychology	4,231
38.	Social Work	3,925
39.	Religion	3,885
40.	Near East	3,710
41.	Drama	2,455
42.	Spanish	2,268
43.	Scandinavian	1,898
44.	South Asia	1,848
45.	Exchanges	1,756
46.	Curriculum	1,363
47.	Italian	1,161
48.	Communications	767
49.	Other Languages	716
50.	Contemporary Issues	437
51.	Asian Exchanges	262
52.	Maps	18

57.	ILL-Xerox	1,000
58.	East Asia Exchange	415

BNA MONOGRAPH PUBLISHING

	1975/76 Monograph Publishing	1976/77 Monograph Budget	Amount Published Minus Amount of Budget	Budget as % of Publishing
1. Science Reading Room	38,942	24,615	14,327	63%
2. Engineering	35,785	20,260	15,525	57%
3. Language/Literature/Classics	34,133	23,605	10,528	69%
4. History	30,934	39,450	(8,516)	128%
5. Chemistry/Pharmacy	22,361	11,570	10,791	52%
6. Art	18,644	18,625	19	100%
7. Business Administration	16,681	13,560	3,121	81%
8. Political Science/Publ. Aff.	16,306	22,555	(6,249)	138%
9. Sociology	13,154	6,515	6,639	50%
10. Fisheries/Oceanography	11,681	6,800	4,881	58%
11. Psychology	10,167	5,820	4,347	57%
12. Economics	9,072	5,485	3,587	60%
13. Education	8,770	10,010	(1,240)	114%
14. Mathematics	8,521	4,390	4,131	52%
15. Physics/Astronomy	7,404	5,410	1,994	73%
16. Bibliography/Librarianship	3,287	4,245	(958)	129%
17. Religion	6,428	4,920	1,508	77%
18. Architecture	6,330	9,750	(3,420)	154%
19. Social Work	6,249	4,860	1,389	78%
20. Anthropology	5,393	6,550	(1,152)	121%
21. Philosophy	5,250	7,240	(1,990)	138%
22. Forest Resources	4,564	4,700	(136)	103%
23. Communications	3,840	1,500	2,340	39%
24. Geography	2,042	4,225	(2,183)	207%
25. Drama	2,041	3,580	(1,539)	175%
	293,851	246,635		

Ranked accoring to "adequacy" of monograph budget

207%	Geography		D
175%	Drama		D
154%	Architecture	M	
138%	Political Science		D
138%	Philosophy		D
129%	Librarianship	M	
128%	History		D
121%	Anthropology		D
114%	Education		D
103%	Forest Resources		D
100%	Art		D
81%	Business Administration		D
78%	Social Work	M	
77%	Religion		
73%	Physics/Astronomy		D
69%	Language/Literature/Classics		D
63%	Science Reading Room		D
60%	Economics		D
58%	Fisheries/Oceanography		D
57%	Psychology		D
57%	Engineering		D
52%	Chemistry/Pharmacy		D
52%	Mathematics		D
50%	Sociology		D
39%	Communications		D

		1975/76 Monograph Publishing	1976/77 Serial Renewal Budget	Publishing Plus Serial Renewals	Actual Mat'ls Budget	Difference	Adequacy
1.	SRR	38,942	95,632	134,574	120,342	-14,232	89%
2.	Engineering	35,785	105,299	141,084	124,978	-16,106	89%
3.	Lang. Lit. Classics	34,133	37,876	72,009	104,239	+32,230	145%
4.	History	30,934	31,392	62,326	67,901	+5,575	109%
5.	Chem/Pharm	22,361	76,048	98,409	87,167	-11,242	89%
6.	Art	18,644	12,097	30,741	30,734	-7	100%
7.	Bus. Admin.	16,681	35,588	52,269	49,655	-2,614	95%
8.	Poli Sci	16,306	15,191	31,497	37,771	+6,274	120%
9.	Sociology	13,154	4,511	17,665	11,526	-6,139	65%
10.	Fish/Ocean	11,681	23,715	35,396	30,500	-4,896	86%
11.	Psych	10,167	4,231	14,398	10,082	-4,316	70%
12.	Econ	9,072	4,858	13,930	9,825	-4,105	71%
13.	Educ	8,770	5,760	14,530	15,800	+1,270	109%
14.	Math	8,521	19,541	28,060	25,588	-2,472	91%
15.	Physics/Astronomy	7,404	30,483	37,887	35,542	-2,345	94%
16.	Librarianship	3,287	4,483	7,770	12,010	+4,240	155%
17.	Religion	6,428	3,885	10,313	8,805	-1,508	85%
18.	Arch	6,330	7,626	13,956	17,422	+3,466	125%
19.	Social Work	6,249	3,925	10,174	+7,854	-2,320	77%
20.	Anthropology	5,398	9,509	14,907	19,194	+4,287	129%
21.	Philosophy	5,250	6,801	12,051	14,041	+1,990	117%
22.	Forest Resources	4,564	11,834	16,398	16,547	+149	101%
23.	Communications	3,840	767	4,607	2,267	-2,340	49%
24.	Geography	2,042	9,319	11,361	13,566	+2,205	119%
25.	Drama	2,041	2,455	4,496	6,035	+1,539	134%
				898,808	879,391		

Ranked by "adequacy" of present materials budget in relation to 1975/76 monograph publishing plus present serial renewal budget

1.	Librarianship	155%
2.	Language/Literature/Classics	145%
3.	Drama	134%
4.	Anthropology	129%
5.	Architecture	125%
6.	Political Science/P.A.	120%
7.	Geography	119%
8.	Philosophy	117%
9.	Education	109%
10.	History	109%
11.	Forest Resources	101%
12.	Art	100%
13.	Business Administration	95%
14.	Physics/Astronomy	94%
15.	Mathematics	91%
16.	Science Reading Room	89%
17.	Engineering	89%
18.	Chemistry/Pharmacy	89%
19.	Fisheries/Oceanography	86%
20.	Religion	85%
21.	Social Work	77%
22.	Economics	71%
23.	Psychology	70%
24.	Sociology	65%
25.	Communications	49%

Ranked by external research/training/fellowship support

1.	Fisheries/Oceanography	$7,994,364
2.	Sciences (SRR)	3,508,459
3.	Forest Resources	2,983,165
4.	Engineering	2,931,948
5.	Physics/Astronomy	2,525,536
6.	Education	1,316,364
7.	Social Work	1,038,861
8.	Chemistry/Pharmacy	871,320
9.	Psychology	782,822
10.	ICFAS	623,065
11.	Business Administration	406,183
12.	Mathematics	303,362
13.	Political Science/P.A.	231,569
14.	Sociology	214,980
15.	Speech & Hearing Sciences	188,642
16.	Economics	119,685
17.	Anthropology	101,163
18.	Communications	77,871
19.	Architecture	72,494
20.	Music	58,016
21.	American Indian Studies	48,047
22.	Geography	42,436
23.	Scandinavian	30,862
24.	Art	20,207
25.	Drama	14,532
26.	Near East	10,194

27.	Women's Studies	8,959
28.	Society & Justice	5,720
29.	English	3,930
30.	History	1,496
31.	Slavic	1,430
32.	Librarianship	1,258
33.	Classics	1,110
34.	Asian L & L	786
35.	Romance L & L	625
36.	Philosophy	425
37.	Germanics	285
38.	Linguistics	154
39.	Comparative Literature	131

Ranking comparisons

Rank	Present Materials Budget	Monograph Publishing & Serial Renewals	Graduate Major Enrollment	Faculty F.T.E.	Undergrad Major Enrollment
1	Engineering	Engineering	Education	Engineering	Engineering
2	Sciences	Sciences	Engineering	Sciences	Business
3	Chem/Pharm	Chem/Pharm	Business	Business	Sciences
4	History	History	Sciences	Education	Psychology
5	Business	Business	Phys/Ast	Math	Art
6	Poli Sci	Phys/Ast	Fish/Ocean	Music	Forest Res
7	Phys/Ast	Fish/Ocean	Social Work	Archiecture	Communications
8	Music	Poli Sci	Architecture	Art	Education
9	Art	Art	Poli Sci	Phys/Ast	Chem/Pharm
10	Fish/Ocean	Math	Forest Res	Chem/Pharm	Architecture
11	Math	Music	Communications	Fish/Ocean	Fish/Ocean
12	Anthropology	Sociology	Math	Social Work	Phys/Ast
13	Architecture	Forest Res	Librarianship	Psychology	Poli Sci
14	Forest Res	Anthropology	Chem/Pharm	Communications	History
15	Education	Education	Psychology	Forest Res	Economics
16	Philosophy	Psychology	Art	History	Music
17	Geography	Architecture	Music	Poli Sci	Math
18	Librarianship	Economics	Economics	Economics	Drama
19	Sociology	Philosophy	History	Anthropology	Sociology
20	Psychology	Geography	Sociology	Sociology	Social Work
21	Economics	Religion	Anthropology	Drama	Anthropology
22	Religion	Social Work	Geography	Philosophy	Geography
23	Social Work	Librarianship	Drama	Geography	Philosophy
24	Drama	Communications	Philosophy	Librarianship	
25	Communications	Drama			

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON LIBRARIES

May 3, 1977

TO: Library Book Selectors

FROM: Collection Development Group

RE: Materials Budget Needs, 1977-79 Survey

The Collection Development Group is discussing book budget allocations for the next biennium. As part of the input to this process, the Group needs information from each selector. Please try to answer the following questions as honestly and accurately as possible. We realize that indicating the budgetary impact in some areas will be very difficult but this knowledge is essential if allocations are to be related to need.

You may wish to consult with your faculty department representative as no separate faculty survey will be issued. Please return this form by May 18th to Carol Cleaves, Chair, Collection Development Group.

I. Monograph Budget

Is your monograph budget adequate to cover:	Yes	No	If "no," how much to provide adequacy?
1. Approval plan receipts?	___	___	$_____
2. Other non-approval U.S. monographs?	___	___	_____
3. Foreign language monographs?	___	___	_____
4. Retrospective buying of out-of-print titles?	___	___	_____
5. Reprints?	___	___	_____
6. Highly-specialized materials, such as foreign theses?	___	___	_____
7. Large serial backfiles (microform or hard copy)?	___	___	_____
8. Other_____?	___	___	_____

II. Serials Budget

Is your serials budget adequate to cover:	Yes	No	If "no," how much to provide adequacy?
1. New serials needed for program support?	___	___	$_____
2. New sets needed for program support?	___	___	_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III. Program Support

Have program or curricula changes occurred in the past two years that:	Yes	No	If "yes," how much of a change?
1. Require an increase in your monograph budget?	___	___	$_____
2. Require an increase in your serials budget?	___	___	_____
3. Suggest a decrease in your monograph budget?	___	___	_____
4. Suggest a decrease in your serials budget?	___	___	_____
Do you expect program or curricula changes in the next two years that:			
1. Require an increase in your monograph budget?	___	___	_____
2. Require an increase in your serials budget?	___	___	_____
3. Suggest a decrease in your monograph budget?	___	___	_____
4. Suggest a decrease in your serials budget?	___	___	_____
Will any such changes involve a transfer of collecting responsibility to another fund?	___	___	_____

If yes, which one(s)_____

Please describe these changes on the verso of this form.

IV. Other Information (use verso of form if necessary)

1. Have you assumed a larger collection development responsibility beyond the University?

for the state?_____ region?_____ What is the budgetary impact of this role?_____

_____

_____

2. Do you receive materials funding from sources other than the library's budget? Do you expect to receive any outside funding in the next two years? Please indicate where this funding is obtained, for how long and for how much._____

_____

3. Are there changes you can suggest that would make the present budgeting allocation or financial reporting system more responsive to your needs?_____

_____

4. Are there other significant factors that should be included in a review of your materials budget allocation? _____

5. How can this form be improved for use in future years? _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DRAFT STATEMENT

DECISION-MAKING
UC Berkeley
4 pp.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

THE GENERAL LIBRARY

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

April 30, 1976

TO: SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE

BOOK BUDGET REALLOCATIONS, 1976-1979

CURRENT BOOK BUDGET PROBLEMS:

The principal sources of user dissatisfaction with Library collections appear to be:

1. Collection gaps caused by: a) failure in the past 3 or 4 years to acquire trade and scholarly publications falling within the scope of our collection policies, but not purchased because of declining funds; and, b) failure to replace needed books which have been lost or stolen.

2. Failure to provide adequate numbers of series of reserve books and other high-use materials needed for curricular support.

3. Inability, because of lack of funds, to seize opportunities for acquiring out-of-print materials which become available.

Other funding problems which must be considered in determining book budget reallocations include:

1. The need to finance purchase of materials formerly received free or at low cost, e.g.: Polish publications, currently received on a PL-480 agreement which ceases December 1976; government publications dropped from depository agreements; serials received on declining exchange agreements.

2. The need to study and reassess funding in areas where publishing costs may have inflated disproportionately in the past 5 years.

3. The need to support new programs, and new courses within existing programs, e.g.: the increased demand from several disciplines for a growing volume of materials on energy; the recently approved interdisciplinary program on film studies.

4. The need to provide a minimal level of support for non-research-oriented teaching programs which are currently suffering almost complete neglect, e.g.: practice of art; dramatic production and stage design.

Attachment I:d

BERKELEY: THE GENERAL LIBRARY
June 7, 1976

To: Mr. Dougherty

From: Sheila Dowd

Subject: A summary of the Selection Committee's current thinking on the book budget

Budget plans for 1976/77:

1. Project serials expenditures on each fund, based on actual expenditures for the past two years, with inflationary factor adjustment. (Stanford's Oct. 1974 Survey of Library Materials Expenditures gives a 13 percent figure for 1974 serials inflation)

2. Distribute base monograph allocations: no. of dollars each fund was allocated at beginning of last budget year.

3. Divide remaining monies as follows:

   a. Reserve materials allocation: 30 percent of remaining disposable funds. Distribute to units according to formula Selection Committee has worked out. Percent of new money is based on number of titles unit has on course reserve for Spring quarter, with science libraries receiving an additional 25 percent on each allocation to cover costs of inflation. (This inflation factor is based on Bowker Annual's prices for science and technology titles as compared with humanities and social sciences titles). It is estimated that each unit with course reserves should be able to buy about 16 percent more reserve titles (or additional copies of about 16 percent of its reserve titles) with this allocation.

   b. Retrospective materials allocation: 10 percent of disposable funds. This amount is too small to be allocated to units (we estimate that it will amount to $10,000-12,000); therefore it will be kept in a central fund the first year, and allocated by the AUL for Collection Development for special purchases requested by selectors. We believe that it may be particularly necessary to have such a central fund, as there is some doubt that the Library will get opportunity funds.

   c. The remaining 60 percent of disposable funds will, in the first year, be allocated as a uniform percentage increase in existing monograph budgets. However, the Committee will continue its study of program pressures, cost factors, and long-term research needs to determine whether adjustments should be made in these monograph allocations when 1977/78 funds are distributed.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—(Letterhead for interdepartmental use)

4. Before the allocations outlined in 3. are made, a decision is needed as to whether to support new programs and new charges from existing allocations to appropriate funds, or from monies taken "off the top" of the funds covered in 3. Occasionally there are no existing allocations to draw on for new costs; for example, after December 1976 about $1,200 per annum must be allocated for Polish publications, previously received free on PL-480. This support, which will maintain a much reduced rate of acquisitions for Polish materials, must be provided before the division of new monies to existing funds. However, the Committee is strongly inclined to the position that new programs within a department must be supported by the Library funds already allocated to that discipline's support, if the department itself is not successful in securing special funds from the campus or from outside sources for "seed money". It believes that the funds reallocated to Berkeley this year are needed to help correct a critically low level of support for our wide range of existing programs, rather than for an extension of our collecting policy into new fields. It is of vital importance that the campus refrain from approving new programs until the "library impact" has been carefully studied and provided for. Examples of the pressures which are currently being brought to bear on Library funds by new programs are the ethnomusicology program in the Music Department and the film studies program in which the Departments of Rhetoric, Comparative Literature and English are collaborating. The campus administration has refused a Music Department request for a grant from the Instructional Improvement Grant Program to provide the core materials, at present almost totally lacking, for the teaching program in ethnomusicology. The Music Library has requested $3,000 to support the instructional program while the Department seeks funds from other sources. Berkeley has until now neither taught nor collected in the area of film studies, a field in which both UCLA and San Francisco State have teaching and research programs. Faculty are now submitting lists of needed items which have previously been considered out of scope for our collections.

Budget plans for 1977/78 and 1978/79:

1. Serials expenditures will continue to be projected on a base of previous year's expenditures plus inflationary adjustment.

2. Base monograph allocations will be adjusted if the Committee's continuing study reveals inequities.

3. Budget supplements from statewide reallocation will again be divided into reserve supplements, retrospective materials allocations, and support for current collecting. However, reserve supplements will be lowered each year (probably 20 percent of 1977/78 new monies and 10 percent of 1978/79 new monies) and retrospective allocations will be proportionately increased. At least a part of the retrospective funds in these two budget years will be allocated directly to the funds with the greatest need for retrospective materials, as the sum available will then be sizable enough to permit such allocation. The funds for current acquisitions will be distributed as dictated by the Committee's study of program pressures, cost factors and long-term research needs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN REALLOCATION:

Figures comparing our support of various disciplines with the level of support maintained at other institutions are useful only as very general indicators. The Berkeley Library is inescapably committed to the support of a very broad range of academic programs. It is always possible to prove that someone else - and sometimes almost everyone else - gives stronger support to a particular discipline. Presumably that institution either has a larger book budget, or is supporting a smaller number of research programs. Internal comparisons are the only just basis for internal fund reallocations. Some of the factors to be considered in reallocation are the following:

1. Program pressures (enrollment, degrees granted, number of faculty, circulation of library materials, etc.)

2. Cost factors (book and serial prices, and volume of publication in the discipline or geographic area)

3. Long-term research demands (the need for an exhaustive level of collecting in collections of particular distinction which serve as regional or national resources)

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF LIBRARY SUPPORT FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS:

A recent Library analysis of our spending of state book funds in 1973/74 reveals the following distribution of expenditures:

Sciences		31%
(Biological Sciences, including Natural Resources,	15%;	
Physical Sciences, including Engineering,	16%)	
Humanities and Social Sciences		51%
(Humanities	17%;	
Social Sciences, including History	21%;	
Interdisciplinary collections in Humanities and Social Sciences	13%)	
General collections and general support		18%

This initial survey indicates that the following are some of the areas which may not be getting a fair share of our "subsistence level" budget: Astronomy; Computer Sciences; Biological Sciences; Business Administration; Psychology. These and other subject allocations will be examined in the light of the program, cost and research factors noted above.

The Library Selection Committee believes that most of the additional resources in 1976/77 and 1977/78 should be used to acquire titles published in the last 3 or 4 years and not purchased for our collections; to replace missing titles; and to supply additional copies of high-use titles. Only in the third year and thereafter should significant allocations for retrospective purchasing be attempted. One proposal under consideration recommends that 30% of the first year's additional funds should be allocated among units with large reserve or high-use collections; 60% among all units for current and 3-year retrospective collecting; and 10% for older retrospective materials.

There is agreement on the Committee that we should continue to endeavor to exert firm control over our serials lists.

Submitted for: SELECTION COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL LIBRARY
by S. Dowd

DECISION-MAKING
UC Davis
10 pp.

DAVIS: OFFICE OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

April 29, 1976

BERN KREISSMAN

As you know, the application of a systemwide formula to the allocation of the acquisitions budget for 1976-77 will lead to an estimated reduction of 3900 volumes in our target for next year, with comparable reductions in the two succeeding years. You are also aware of my concern about this reduction. It is very important for me to have a precise sense of how this might hurt us. Hence, I am asking you to report to me your plans for coping with a reduced budget for acquisitions. Specifically, I would like to know:

(1) How will the reduction of 3900 volumes be achieved?

(2) Will the reduction in fact be more or less than 3,900? (That is, how realistic is the price-increase calculation on which the 3,900 estimate is founded?)

(3) Please list your plans for eliminating or reducing acquisitions in various areas in priority order. That is, if it turns out that some of these funds could be replaced, which categories of cuts would you most quickly restore?

(4) Does the reduction in volumes acquired have implications for your staffing plan? Would you need fewer employees to acquire fewer volumes?

(5) Have you consulted the Senate Library Committee regarding this problem? At some point some consultation will be necessary and I would appreciate an account of the reactions of the Committee.

(6) I understand that we have not achieved our targets in recent years because the books cost more than assumed in the formula. As I recall we purchased 72,000 rather than 78,000 last year. To what extent can possible economies produce a level of purchasing closer to the budgeted target, thus softening the impact of the reduction?

Leon Mayhew

LM/ah

Bern Kreissman
Library
Davis Campus

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—(Letterhead for interdepartmental use)

April 29, 1976

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TO: Bern Kreissman, University Librarian

RE: Approaches to Book Budget Allocations in 1976/77 to Adjust to the Projected 3,900 Volume Reduction in the campus' Acquisition level

The following steps are contemplated to reduce the impact of the reduction of campus' acquisition level:

1. The campus Budget Office has informed the Library that it will receive $20,000 as a cost increase allowance for 1976/77. This increase will be distributed to allocations (by field or type of library material) having the highest campus acquisitions priority. Distribution will be based on an analysis of 1975/76 expenditure patterns and the advice of the Academic Senate Library Committee.

2. The Library's 1975/76 allocation for major reference sets and serial backfiles (Serials and Sets) should be reduced to a minimum, e.g., the present $100,000 would be reduced to around $50,000. The $50,000 released would again be distributed to the Library accounts having the greatest need.

   Reducing the Library's "Serials and Sets" (S & S) allocation will mean that UC Davis will have to rely more heavily on the resources of other UC libraries to meet the campus' library material requirements.

   If the Library receives year end savings from the Administration as in previous years, the monies received would be used to purchase as many high priority requests "S & S" that would accumulate during 1976/77 as the funds would permit. In addition, the Library would also seek to have Systemwide "Shared Purchase" funds utilized to acquire materials needed by UC Davis - these materials would not necessarily be housed in a UC Davis library.

3. After the recommended adjustments are made (after Academic Senate Library Committee Reviews) the Library accounts using all available funds from either "cost increase" funds or reductions in "Underutilized" book funds the remaining accounts would be frozen at their 1975/76 level.

4. The Library will give the acquisition of newly published books a higher priority than the acquisition of retrospective works. This can be accomplished by liening the funds required to support the Library's various "Standing Order Approval Plans" at the start of the year. The above steps will in turn limit the amount of money each allocation will be able to free for restrospective materials. These actions

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—(Letterhead for interdepartmental use) D2861

will again for UC Davis to rely more heavily on other UC libraries (or ILL's) for restrospective materials.

5. The library will sharply limit any additions to its periodical subscriptions list - only titles considered absolutely essential to UC Davis' teaching and research program can be added, e.g., 100 - 150 titles compared to the approximately 400 titles added in the past - the Library has already applied this approach to 1975/76 current periodical recommendation.

Both Vernon Lust and I believe that the above "plan of action" will "buy" the Library time to make adjustments in the Library's acquisitions priorities. However, even if it does not become apparent that Systemwide is going to reduce our acquisitions level further in 1977/78 the Library will need to begin a systematic review of its periodical and/or serial subscriptions list in 1976/77.

The objectives of this review will be to:

1. Reduce all duplicate subscriptions to titles whose use no longer under current circumstances justifies duplication. For instance, the General Library subscribes to three sets of Chemical Abstracts at $3,000/year - the campus may be required to make do with one or two sets.

2. "Low use" titles will have to be spared from the list. This course of action will be extremely time consuming and will have to actively involve the efforts of both the library staff and representatives of the faculty.

3. A regional approach to periodical subscriptions will have to be pursued by UC Davis and other libraries. For instance this Library may agree to maintain "low use" botanical journals published in Eastern Europe if Berkeley agrees to maintain "low use" botanical journals published in mainland China.

Nelson A. Piper
Assistant University Librarian,
Collections

NAP/cbl

TO: Leon Mayhew, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

FROM: Bernard Kreissman, University Librarian

RE: Your memorandum of April 29, 1976 concerning the Library's proposed response to the application of a Systemwide formula to the allocation of campus book budgets in 1976/77.

The Library's answer (or responses) to the questions raised in your memorandum concerning the reduction in the UC Davis are as follows:

Questions 1 and 2: How will the reduction of 3,900 volumes be achieved? and Will the reduction in fact be more or less than 3,900?

The decline in UC Davis' libraries acquisitions levels will be less than 3,900 volumes - the actual decline will be 2,242 volumes. The division of the $22,000 in cost increase money allocated to the campus libraries for books will result in lower acquisitions levels for the Main Library (including the Physical Sciences Library) and Health Sciences Library in 1976/77. The acquisitions level for the Law Library is expected to remain at the same level as its 1975/76 acquisitions rate. The change in acquisitions levels for 1976/77 compared to 1975/76 are described in the following table:

	Projected Operating Budget Acquisitions 1975/76	Projected Operating Budget Acquisitions 1976/77	Change	%Change
Main Library	55,723 v.	53,899 v.	(1,824)	(3.27)
Health Sciences Library	8,823	8,405	(415)	(4.74)
	64,546	62,304	2,242	(3.47)
Law Library	7,440	7,440	-	-
	71,986 v.	69,744 v.	2,242 v.	3.11%

Explanatory Data

Although the percentage decline in the acquisitions rate is greater in the Health Sciences Library (HSL) than for both the Main Library and the Law Library, the amount of the cost increase allowance allocated to HSL ($8,664) is substantially larger in proportion to its library budget than the increases granted the Main Library ($11,336) and Law Library ($2,000). The larger allowance granted to the HSL is based on the high cost of library materials in medicine and the limited flexibility of the HSL to make changes in the acquisitions pattern required to support two library facilities (the campus library and the Sacramento Medical Center). The Main Library has been able to limit the decline in its acquisitions level because of a greater flexibility to adjust the proportion of its budget allocation devoted to costly materials such as serial backfiles, multi-volume sets, reference materials and new journal subscriptions than HSL. The Law Library expects to maintain its 1975/76 acquisitions level in 1976/77 by reducing its expenditures for library materials in microformat.

Price Increase Calculations:

The price increase calculations which the State Department of Finance permits Systemwide to utilize in its allocation of cost increase funds for library materials have been extremely unrealistic. Evidence of the weaknesses in their methodology can readily be seen in the decline in the Davis' campus' actual purchasing power from the 78,000 purchase volumes projected by Systemwide for UC Davis and the 71,986 purchase volumes that our libraries will actually be able to acquire with the funds allocated to the campus. A report recently received from Systemwide indicates that the State is beginning to show a willingness to recognize a different (higher) inflationary calculation for campus' whose programs emphasize scientific research and graduate professional training. In practical terms, this recognition might mean that the State would be willing to grant more equitable cost increase allowances to offset the substantially greater inflationary spiral for scientific and professional books and journals beginning in 1977/78.

In the past the State has either granted the University cost increase monies based on the rise in the Wholesale Price Index and/or the general inflationary rate for domestic books. The above practices resulted in cost increase allowances for library books of 0% in 1970/71, 0% in 1971/72, 3.9% in 1972/73, 9.5% in 1973/74, 7.5% in 1974/75, and 9.75% in 1975/76. These allowances were granted during a period when the general domestic price index for books and periodicals between 1970-74 increased 10.12%/year for books and 17.42%/year for periodicals - the index for journals in chemistry and physics during the same period rose by 27.90%/year. The above resume indicates that the cost increase allowance granted UC Davis libraries fell far short of the amount required to offset the effects of inflation and devaluation on their book budgets.

Question 3: Plans for eliminating or reducing acquisitions in various areas in priority order.

A. Eliminations or reductions in the Library's current acquisitions patterns.

In order to reduce the impact of the reduction in the campus' acquisitions level, the Library is proposing that the following changes in its book budget allocations for 1976/77, the suggested changes are arranged in descending order of priority.

1) Reduce the General Library's "Serials and Sets" allocation for serial backfiles, multi-volume sets, etc., from $100,020 to $66,336. This action would result in the Library acquiring 1,707 volumes with S & S funds in 1976/77 as compared to the 2,896 volumes acquired with S & S funds in 1975/76 - a reduction of 1,189 volumes. The funds freed by the reduction of the S & S allocation would be shifted to the Library's monographic and periodical allocations to maintain its current periodicals and monographic acquisitons level as close to the Library's level in 1975/76 as possible.

2) Keep the Library's "Non-Book" allocations at the campus' 1975/76 allocation.

Inflation alone would insure a reduction of the General Library's acquisitions in this area in 1975/76. The General Library, however, is reluctant to further reduce its allocations for non-book materials in view of the already limited allocations being provided for audio-visual materials.

The Law library, however, intends to reduce its 1975/76 non-book mateirals allocation in order to maintain its serial subscriptions and monographic acquisitions in 1976/77.

3) Limit any new additions to the campus' serial (including pericdicals) subscription list in 1976/77.

In 1973/74 the Library began to limit new serial subscriptions to titles considered essential to the campus' instructional and research programs. New subscriptions to general and recreational titles of interest to the academic community at large have been held to a minimum. In 1976/77 only titles which are considered absolutely essential to the campus' academic program may be considered for addition to the Library's collection. It is therefore suggested that new journal subscriptions be limited to approximately 150 new titles in 1976/77; during the 1970/71 - 1974/75 academic years the General Library alone added more than 400 new periodical titles each year. The addition of any new titles above the 150 base should be limited to titles which can be purchased with the duplicate subscriptions and/or "low use" titles as determined by joint Library/Faculty review (when appropriate) of the Library's current subscription list.

4) Reduce the campus' acquisition of current and retrospective monographic volume.

Acquisitions level for monographs should be held as close to the campus' current level as possible. The rationale for this recommendation is to insure a "normal" (as is possible) acquisitions rate of newly published monographs in order to avoid the build-up of "want lists" for current materials which will go out of print before additional funds become available. In addition, the Library wishes to quarantee some continued acquisition of restrospective monographs essential to support the campus' academic program.

The proposed adjustments in the General Library book budget should result in a drop in the Library's monographic intake of 267 volumes from the library's projected intake of 40,949 volumes in 1975/76. The level of acquisitions for monographic volumes in Health Sciences Library and Law Library will remain at approximately the same level in 1976/77 as in 1975/76.

B. Restoration priorities if funds could be replaced.

The Library's priorities for the utilization of any funds that might be obtained to restore (or alleviate) the priority reduction in the campus acquisitions level in order of priority are as follows:

1) Serials and Sets (S & S) Reductions.

First priority should be given to the restoring cuts in the Library's S & S acquisitions. High priority requests for S & S materials requested by the faculty and Library staff could be accumulated by the Library during the course of the 1976/77 fiscal year. Titles that the Library had been unable to order with "regular budget" funds could be ordered with a minimum

of effort by our staff if additional funds should be received near the end of the fiscal year. The Library will also plan to make use of Systemwide "Shared Purchase" funds to acquire S & S materials for which delayed access to the materials purchased may be acceptable for the students and faculty at UC Davis. It should be remembered, however, that materials acquired in this manner may not be housed on the Davis campus.

2) Non-book Materials Reductions.

Second priority (almost co-equal to our first priority) should be given to utilizing "restored funds" to acquire non-book materials, particularly micro-forms, essential for the support of the campus' academic program. The Library could expend a substantial amount of any supplemental funds it received for library materials in microformat and/or audio-visual materials (audio-tapes, slides, films video-tapes, etc.) that would fill a definite need in the campus' instructional materials program. The availability of special or year end funds to acquire non-book (or non-print) materials is of special significance since the campus (and the Library) has been reluctant to further reduce its book acquisition rate by the ordering of non-book materials which do not add to the campus' volume count. The staff effort required to place orders for the bulk of the more costly non-book materials is far less than the monographs or other single items orders.

3) Monographic Acquisition Reductions.

The additional staff required to process individual monographic orders would make it difficult for the Library to devote a substantial amount of any special funds to the acquisition of monographs. Consequently, the Library can not recommend this alternative.

4) Periodical Subscription Reductions.

Unless permanent funding could be obtained, the Library would be reluctant to commit extra monies to the acquisition of new periodicals and serials.

Question 4: Does the reduction in volumes have implications for your staffing?

The reduction in volumes to be acquired in 1976/77 does have implications for the General Library staffing. The General Library is reducing the staffing assigned to the technical (Acquisitions/Processing) area by 2 FTE Library Assistant (LA) positions - 1.50 FTE LA-L positions, and a .50 FTE LA-2 position. The specific reductions in the Library's Acquisitions/Processing (A/P) areas are: the Acquisitions Department .50 FTE LA-1; the Catalog Department 1.00 FTE LA-1, and the Serials Department .50 FTE LA-2.

The LA-1 positions have been redistributed to enable the Reference/Circulation (R/C) area to meet sharply increased public service demands in the following areas:

1.00 FTE	Reserve Book Service
.50 FTE	Interlibrary Loan Service

The projected workload increases in the above units and other public service areas have been used by the Budget office to request substantial increases in the Library's R/C staffing in the campus' 1977/78 budget request - we are all aware that the campus did not receive an R/C staffing increment for 1976/77. Funds from the vacated LA-2 position (General Assistance) will be utilized on a temporary basis in 1976/77 to help defray part of the costs of developing an automated circulation system for the Shields Library.

The campus administration must continue to realize that even if workload increases and the development of a new automated library system did not require the reassignment of staff that there are still many legitimate work functions in both the A/P and the R/C areas which go unrecognized by present workload staff criteria utilized by Systemwide. Some of the overlooked areas which could effectively utilize additional FTE include: the preparation of additional anaytics for serial publications; the cataloging of microformat (and other non-book) materials received by the Library; the developmental and maintenance time required to implement automated library systems; and the time that is required to maintain the campus' library collections, or to integrate our collections (and services) into a regional or University-wide library network. The latter problem will become especially importnat due to the severe library space shortage facing UC Davis in the coming years.

Questions 5: Have you consulted the Senate Library Committee.

The Senate Library Committee has been apprised of the problems that could arise from the continued application of the allocation formula for the library book acquisitions. Members of the committee have received (and discussed) the various documents dealing with the "Master Plan for UC Libraries". The committee has also received copies of Vice-President Swain's memorandum on the allocation of library acquisitions and a copy of Vice Chancellor Learn's response to that formula. In addition, the committee members has each received a copy of my "Draft for Review" to your memorandum of April 29th. The committee's reactions were...

Question 6: To what extent can possible economies produce a level of purchasing closer to the budgeted target, thus softening the impact of the reduction. The primary reason for the difference between campus and Systemwide projections of the purchase volume acquisiton level for UC Davis is the result of the utilization of a general rather than a specific price increase calculation by the State to the University's book budgets for a number of years. The effects of this practice were mentioned briefly in my response to Questions 1 and 2. There are, however, three ways that economies might produce a level of purchasing closer to the target figure. They are as follows:

A. Consider further reductions in the Library's S & S allocations.

The Library might consider reducing its allocation for S & S acquisitions, e.g., serial backfiles, multi-volume sets, reference material, etc., even further than contemplated in my response to Question 3. If the Library followed this course of action the students and the faculty at UC Davis would be required to rely even more heavily on the resources of other libraries in

Northern California and/or other campuses of the University for important reference and research materials. In reality, however, it will be extremely difficult for the Library to reduce its S & S allocations to a significant degree below the level already projected for 1976/77 without having adverse effects on library service at the campus level. Until bibliographic and/or physical access to the resources of all UC libraries are substantially improved it would be premature to place too great a reliance on shared resources. Moreover, many titles purchased with S & S funds are reference sources and bibliographic tools (indexes, abstracts, etc.) that are not appropriate candidates for shared use, since they are required at every university library.

B. The $45,000 allocation for non-Book materials, e.g., materials in microformat, audio-visual materials, etc., might be reduced from its current level.

Any monies not expended for non-book materials might be diverted to our monographic allocations to permit the acquisitions of additional monographic volumes. This action would increase UC Davis' acquisitions level by substituting lower cost materials which would count as volumes for acquisitions which do not add to the Library's volume count. Acceptance of this alternative, however, would further erode the Library's already minimal acquisitions program for audio-visual materials.

C. Eliminate as many duplicate and "low use" periodical subscriptions as possible.

The Library in cooperation with the faculty must re-examine the subscription lists of all libraries on the Davis campus to eliminate the unnecessary duplication of all titles which have recurring costs to reduce expenditures not justified under our present circumstances. An extension of this alternative is to attempt as much as possible to concentrate certain interdisciplinary materials in a single campus library - the Main Library and/or one of its branches or the Law Library. For instance, books and journals in clinical psychology and immunology and primatology might be housed in the Health Sciences Library; materials in anatomy, physiology and neurology might be housed in either the Main Library and/or the Health Sciences Library.

Our libraries and their users should also contemplate purchasing only a single set of costly abstract services such as Chemical Abstracts (3,000/year) and Science Citation Index ($3,800 including cumulations) - the General Library presently subscribes to three sets of Chemical Abstracts.

In conjunction with the reduction of intracampus duplication of periodical resources, the Library in concert with the faculty should also seek to eliminate "low use" titles from the subscription list of various campus libraries. Titles identified as receiving minimal use should either be cancelled or considered by Systemwide for "shared purchase" funds.

Over a period of time a judicious review of the campus' subscription list could result in a significant savings for all libraries on the Davis campus. A recent survey of periodical titles available in more than one location on the campus revealed that approximately 550 titles are duplicated in one or more locations, i.e., the Main Library, the Health Sciences Library and/or the Physical Sciences Library. Assuming that this list might be pared by approximately a third, the gap between the UC Davis' projected acquisition level might be reduced between 700 and 1,000 volumes if the funds released were utilized to purchase less expensive monographic titles.

It therefore seems that the most likely avenue for the Library to further reduce non-essential duplication of periodicals and for the Library and its users to place a greater reliance on other UC libraries or on regional (or national) library networks for access to "low use" journals. As mentioned earlier dependence on other libraries to meet our library resource requirements and service needs has many pitfalls. In view of the limited funding prospects for libraires, the growing interdependence amoung libraries to meet the needs of their students and faculty represents an alternative that the UC Davis and it libraries will have to give serious consideration. It should, however, be remembered that a thorough review of the Library's periodical collection would require considerable time and effort on the part of both Library staff and faculty - an estimate of two to three years to complete such a review is minimal.

BK/NP/cl

June 10, 1977

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DECISION-MAKING
UC Davis
5 pp.

TO: College of Letters and Science Departments
Attention: Department Chairmen
and
Library Representatives

FROM: Nelson A. Piper, Assistant University Librarian, Collections

RE: Guide to the Allocation of Book Funds Questionnaire

W. Eric Gustafson, Chairman of the Standing Committee on the Library of the College of Letters and Science has asked me to route the enclosed questionnaire to all departments in the college. Since the information requested will be used by his Committee in the allocation of book funds to L&S departments it will be greatly appreciated if your staff can complete the questionnaire as soon as possible.

A copy of the questionnaire has been sent to all department chairmen and library representatives to facilitate the completion of the form. A department (or committee) will need to return only one copy to the Library; the second copy may be retained for its records. The copy returned to the Library should be signed by the department chairman and mailed to the following address:

W. Eric Gustafson, Chairman
Letters and Science Library Committee
c/o Collection Development Department
Shields Library
Campus

If you have any questions concerning the data that has been requested please contact me at telephone number 752-2110 or the Head of the Collection Development Department (Vernon Lust) at telephone number 752-6381 or 752-3051.

NAP:cbl

Enclosure

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA – (Letterhead for interdepartmental use) D3877 (2/76)

June 10, 1977 PHIL

RECEIVED
JUN 24 1977
COLL. DEV. DEPT.
LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

College of Letters and Science
Standing Committee on the Library

Guide to the Allocation of Book Funds for 1977/78

The information requested below is needed by the Library Committee to assist it in the determination of your department's library book fund allocation for the coming academic year. The information supplied will be used only to assist the Committee in its determination of allotments; it will not be the sole determining factor. Departments should remember that the book fund allocation represents only a portion of the monies available to support the library requirements of a department. Please complete the questionnaire and return it to the address given by Monday, June 27, 1977.

I. Doctoral candidates enrolled in your department, Spring 1977
(Undergraduate and masters level enrollment figures are not required since the Registrar's Office can supply us with this information.)

Number of Ph.D. candidates 5

II. Number of courses offered by your department.
List subdivisions of a course, i.e., IA - IB, as only a single course.

A. Courses that are currently listed in 1976/77 General Catalog.

58

B. Courses offered in 1976/77 not listed in the 1975/76 General Catalog.

1. Lower Division —
2. Upper Division —
3. Graduate —

C. New courses scheduled to be offered during 1977/78.

1. Lower Division 2
2. Upper Division —
3. Graduate —

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III. Size of academic staff. List the number of full-time faculty staff members. Please do not list associates or teaching assistants.

A. Size of current staff 10

B. Projected staff changes for 1977/78 -

If possible, list the names of new faculty members below and their areas of interest.
G.J. Mattey: 18th & 19th century history of philosophy; Idealism, Skepticism, Philosophy of Mind, History of Science.

IV. Authorized changes in academic programs, 1977/78. If possible please give specific areas of concentration for the new programs. Interdisciplinary (or group) programs involving your department (or staff) should be listed also.

A. B.A. or B.S.
B. M.A. or M.S.
C. Ph.D.
D. Other, i.e., interdisciplinary programs, institutes, etc.

V. Projected changes in academic programs. Provide specific dexcriptions of new areas of concentration and expected dates of commencement of any changes. Interdisciplinary (or group) programs involving your department (or staff) should be listed also.

A. B.A. or B.S.
B. M.A. or M.S.
C. Ph.D.
D. Other, i.e., interdisciplinary programs, institutes, etc.

VI. Additional comments. If necessary, please attach an additional sheet.

We would like to continue to strengthen our holdings in Greek and medieval philosophy. They were commented on very favorably by a distinguished English visiting scholar, Professor Hilary Armstrong. Holdings in German philosophy, particularly Kant through Nietzsche should also be augmented.

Department Philosophy

Chairman

Send form to:
W.Eric Gustafson
Letters and Science Library Committee
c/o Collection Development Department
Shields Library
Campus

June 10, 1977

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

College of Letters and Science
Standing Committee on the Library

RECEIVED
JUL 13 1977
COLL. DEV. DEPT.
LIBRARY

Guide to the Allocation of Book Funds for 1977/78

The information requested below is needed by the Library Committee to assist it in the determination of your department's library book fund allocation for the coming academic year. The informaion supplied will be used only to assist the Committee in its determination of allotments; it will not be the sole determining factor. Departments should remember that the book fund allocation represents only a portion of the monies available to support the library requirements of a department. Please complete the questionnaire and return it to the address given by Monday, June 27, 1977.

I. Doctoral candidates enrolled in your department, Spring 1977
(Undergraduate and masters level enrollment figures are not required since the Registrar's Office can supply us with this information.)

Number of Ph.D. candidates 17

II. Number of courses offered by your department.
List subdivisions of a course, i.e., IA - IB, as only a single course.

A. Courses that are currently listed in 1976/77 General Catalog.

97

B. Courses offered in 1976/77 not listed in the 1975/76 General Catalog.

1. Lower Division _____
2. Upper Division _____ None
3. Graduate _____

C. New courses scheduled to be offered during 1977/78.

1. Lower Division _____
2. Upper Division _____ None
3. Graduate _____

III. Size of academic staff. List the number of full-time faculty staff members. Please do not list associates or teaching assistants.

A. Size of current staff 14

B. Projected staff changes for 1977/78 1 Visiting Prof.

If possible, list the names of new faculty members below and their areas of interest.

IV. Authorized changes in academic programs, 1977/78. If possible please give specific areas of concentration for the new programs. Interdisciplinary (or group) programs involving your department (or staff) should be listed also.

A. B.A. or B.S.

*B. M.A. or M.S.

*C. Ph.D.

D. Other, i.e., interdisciplinary programs, institutes, etc.

V. Projected changes in academic programs. Provide specific dexcriptions of new areas of concentration and expected dates of commencement of any changes. Interdisciplinary (or group) programs involving your department (or staff) should be listed also.

** A. B.A. or B.S.

B. M.A. or M.S.

C. Ph.D.

D. Other, i.e., interdisciplinary programs, institutes, etc.

VI. Additional comments. If necessary, please attach an additional sheet.

* Attached are revised M.A. and Ph.D. programs which have been approved. The Ph.D. reading list is still being finalized; a copy will be sent upon final completion.

** Development of a new B.A. Program will be forwarded to the Courses Committee sometime during 1977/78 for implementation the following year.

Department Spanish

Chairman A. Sánchez-Romeralo

Send form to:
W.Eric Gustafson
Letters and Science Library Committee
c/o Collection Development Department
Shields Library
Campus

DECISION-MAKING
UCLA
2 pp.

August 1, 1973

THE ALLOCATION OF BOOK FUNDS WITHIN THE UCLA LIBRARY SYSTEM

Book fund allocations within the UCLA Library System have been developed over the years in a manner which has attempted to be as responsive as possible to the present needs of the present academic program at UCLA, and also to anticipate the future directions of that program, insofar as this is possible. Since UCLA's academic program and book budget have been rapidly expanding within the past twenty years or so, the changes have largely involved increases in the scope and depth of our collecting, and of course have reflected the changing structure of the Library system itself, as it has added new libraries and broadened collecting responsibilities in existing ones.

This period of rapid expansion of both the academic programs and the book budget is past, however, and we find ourselves in a position of having to spread a declining book budget (in terms of purchasing power) thinner and thinner in order to support a less dramatically expanding but still constantly changing academic program. This requires that we take a close look at our present pattern of allocating funds and attempt to determine whether it can be improved in any way.

Any attempt to modify this pattern should of course begin with an understanding of the present situation, so I have developed the following brief statement on the purpose and/or history of each allotment or group of allotments which seems to require it:

Librarian's Reserve - This reserve fund is of vital importance in providing the flexibility which is needed to respond to unforeseen and unforeseeable emergencies and opportunities.

URL Current Books - A fund to pay for the currently published monographs needed by the departments served by the URL. There is no attempt to assign specific amounts by subject within the fund because of the interdisciplinary nature of so much of the material. Items over $50.00, translations and reprints are excluded.

URL Continuations/Subscriptions - This fund originally paid for all serial subscriptions within the Library system, but in March 1962 it was decided that all future subscriptions except for general periodicals for URL would be paid for from branch library, bibliographer, or subject allotments. In 1968 the branch library subscriptions were removed from this fund and charged to the individual units, which were also credited with the amount of the last annual payment for each subscription charged to them. In 1972 the subscriptions paid for from this fund were reviewed by the bibliographers and the Serials Department, and a number were cancelled.

URL Standing Orders - A fund to pay for sets needed in the URL.

URL Acquisitions - For Graduate Reserve Service materials and Technical Service Department monographs, subscriptions and standing orders.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Barter Exchange and UC Press Exchange - These funds pay for our exchange program which involves more than 3,700 institutions in 125 countries.

Replacements/Lost Books - This fund supplements the money we receive from billings for lost books and the combined sum is distributed to units according to a formula which takes into account the total book fund allocation of each unit and the amount it has billed for lost books.

URL Area Allotments - These allotments are the responsibility of the area bibliographers and are for the purchase of all types of materials for the URL stack collection, excepting only newly published materials which fall within the definition of "Current Books" given above.

URL Subject Allotments - These funds are assigned to academic departments which are served primarily by the URL. They are used for faculty-initiated orders, principally for serial subscriptions and retrospective monographs, and they complement the URL area allotments.

Allocations to the various funds into which the Library book budget has been divided have been made on the basis of representations from the unit heads, individual selectors and faculty members as to their needs, and our best judgment as to how these various needs can most equitably be met.

DECISION-MAKING
UCLA
3 pp.

MINUTES

UNIT HEADS and BIBLIOGRAPHERS MEETING

HAINES HALL, ROOM 118

November 29, 1973 (2:00 p.m.)

N. Dudley opened the meeting with the following remarks:

The memo you received dated November 7th stated that on November 21st (now November 29th) we would hold a unit heads and bibliographers meeting to get suggestions about specific criteria to be used in allocating funds and about general approaches to the problem. A small working group of not more than six people, which I would chair, would be appointed at this meeting to develop and attempt to test the validity of the suggestions received there (and any others received or generated subsequently) and to draft a report, which hopefully would contain alternative recommendations.

I'd like to take up the matter of the composition of the working group first. At the November 14th Advisory Council meeting, when random groups were asked to comment on the plan, as set forth in the November 7th memo, there was general agreement that it was a good way to go. Norah Jones, speaking for Random Group III, raised a number of questions about the methodology the working group would employ and also about the selection of members. She said the selection would have to be either random or representative, and since she assumed it would not be random, then I should perhaps come to the meeting with a set of criteria for selecting members representatively or actually come with the selection already made. I replied that I didn't agree that the only two choices for selection were random or representative, that expertise and interest were at least as important. I said further that in one sense I was extremely anxious that members not be representative, in the sense of fighting for their own unit's special interests. It's vitally important that all members approach this problem disinterestedly (although of course not uninterestedly), otherwise we can never hope to make any progress. Norah's response to this was that of course we would expect an objective look, but it had to be one which reflected various points of view among the units. The problems relating to this question are different in different units and we'll need a broad range of views.

In reply to an earlier question I had said that members would be chosen either by asking for volunteers or that selection would be made on the basis of contributions at the meeting. After Norah's comments, however, I said I reserved the right to act on her group's suggestions after thinking more about them. I did think more about them and the more I thought about them the better I liked them. We must have knowledgeable, interested people, and we must have a broad range of viewpoints, and with this in mind I have selected the following people for the working group: Louise Darling, Jim Davis, Charlotte Georgi, Fred Smith and Charlotte Spence. All but Louise have been contacted and have agreed to serve.

Obviously, not every unit or every kind of unit is represented here, but every

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

effort will be made to get all your views, both today and as the group proceeds with its task. Let me say something about how the group will proceed before we get comments and suggestions.

In order to decide what we should do to modify our present procedures, this working group will do a number of things: First, it will take a look at what we've done in the past, and what our criteria have been. Second, it will look at what others have done, and what others have suggested doing. This will of course involve a literature search. Third, it will gather and generate additional ideas from its own membership and from the rest of the staff who are involved. Fourth, it will take all the data it has accumulated, evaluate it, and attempt to derive from it one or more mechanisms or formulas for allocating our book funds.

It's the third step that we'd like to concentrate on today, as I have indicated. It seems to me when we talk about possible criteria to use in allocating funds to various parts of our Library system that we're talking about ways of quantifying the needs of (or the demands made on) those parts. This can be done in a number of ways, which can be grouped as follows:

We can talk about need based on:

1. The scope of the program(s) being served (number of students, faculty, degree programs and sub-programs, courses, etc.)

2. Use of the collection (circulation, interlibrary loan, turnstile counts, etc.)

3. Universe of publishing (number of titles published in pertinent field e.g., monographs and serials and non-book materials).

4. Past experience (present size of allocations and statements from librarians and/or faculty members on its adequacy, using whatever criteria they feel are most relevant. This of course is what we do know primarily.)

5. Other (and I'm sure there are other ways of quantifying needs).

There are also other approaches, and I'd like your comments on other specific criteria, other general approaches, or anything else that's relevant to this matter.

Discussion following Mr. Dudley's remarks included the following comments:

1. We must consider not only programs we are now serving, but also programs we will be required to serve in the future. We must know all we can about these programs.

2. Consider interdisciplinary programs and their effect on our collections and services in all the units affected.

3. Consider increasing costs including foreign countries' dollar devaluation, and increases in the price of all library materials, including microform, microfilms, tapes and audio visual equipment, and postal rate increases. Consider also different unit costs in different libraries.

4. The Voigt formula is totally inadequate for our purposes, and should not be used.

5. Consider how much should be set aside for reserves.

6. Are we continuing to build collections when the programs they are supporting are no longer active? We should review the relevancy of all our collections as we proceed.

7. We must continue to give a high priority to serials. Breaks in serial runs are more serious than gaps in monographic holdings in general, but we must also recognize the differing importance of serials in different fields.

8. The effects of political pressure on allocations must somehow be taken into consideration, if possible.

Mr. Dudley requested any and all comments, suggestions or thoughts, which staff members had on this matter. At this early stage in the working group's deliberations it would appreciate citations to any articles or books dealing with the matter of allocations which staff members feel might be useful, whether or not they deal directly with libraries. Please send these directly to Fred Smith.

Mr. Dudley stated that progress reports would be made regularly, probably through the Advisory Council.

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
(Mrs.) Inez L. Bril

ib

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT LIBRARY

DECISION-MAKING
Univ. of Connecticut
3 pp.

June 8, 1976

TO: Department Heads/Supervisors
Branch and Professional School Librarians

FROM: Norman D. Stevens
University Librarian

For sometime now I have been concerned about our present method of allocating the book budget to various library departments and the branch and professional school libraries. This concern has also been expressed by various staff members as well as indicated in the MRAP report.

For the past few months new procedures for allocating the book budget have been discussed at the Administration Meeting with Mr. Peters participating. The attached statement represents our thinking on this matter. I would appreciate your written comments regarding the statement by Wednesday June 16th.

We hope to implement the procedures after reviewing your comments. Because of the lateness of the distribution of the statement I suggest that you begin preparing your program statements and estimate of fund needs even though the document may be subject to some changes or modifications pending your comments. I would like to be able to make the specific allocations before the end of July. Since we have received our library materials budget for next year we will, however, be sending out orders beginning the end of June.

Norman D. Stevens

NS/dmt

Norman Stevens

GUIDELINES FOR BUDGET ALLOCATION FOR LIBRARY MATERIALS

At the beginning of each fiscal year after the allocation for the library equipment budget is received, the library administration, in conjunction with the Head of the Acquisitions Department, will develop a program statement outlining guidelines for expenditures of the monies for the year. The program statement, following the Collection Development Policy (when available), will indicate specific money allocations as well as emphasizing areas, subjects and/or programs that should receive special attention. Specific allocations will be made for the branch, departmental and professional school libraries (excluding the Health Center Library), designated departments of the University Library, on-going commitments, and special purposes such as developing or building a specific collection.

It is, of course, necessary for the program statement to thoroughly reflect the needs of the university and library programs and to meet the present and future requirements of the users. The library collection, staff and budget have increased significantly over the past ten years and it is becoming increasingly difficult for any one individual to comprehend the total library operations and use as well as the university programs and teaching trends. In order to provide adequate information and ensure staff input each department and library maintaining a collection will submit, by July 1, a program statement and request for funds for special programs for his/her area for the coming year. The statements, following the guidelines established by the Collection Development Policy, should include a brief description of the nature of the collection and any additional information affecting the expenditure of funds such as areas, subjects, etc. that need strengthening, retrospective purchases, requests for major items or special projects and the identification of relatively expensive items, in relation to other items in the collection, with an indication of their priority. Recognizing that it is not possible to predict publishers' output nor the availability of specific titles, the statements should also, nevertheless, indicate an estimate of the amount of money needed to adequately maintain the collection. The Acquisitions Department will have the responsibility for submitting a program statement for the University Library's general collection and for subscriptions, standing orders, blanket orders, and any other on-going commitments. Individual staff members may submit program statements for specific areas/programs that they deem worthy of special attention. The statements should follow the guidelines for departments and libraries as outlined above.

The library administration, in conjunction with the Head of the Acquisitions Department, will be responsible for determining the allocations and for making any necessary adjustments especially if additional funds are forthcoming or if there is a cut in the funds.

The program statements should be submitted to the library administration from the following departments and libraries by July 1.

University Library, Storrs

Acquisitions Department
Bindery Department
Government Publications Department
Olson Archives
Pharmacy Library
Reserve

Map Room
Micro/Media (Audio Visual Materials only)

Music Library

Reference Department
Serials Department (retrospective purchases)
Special Collections Department

Branch and Professional School Libraries

Hartford Branch Library
Marine Sciences Institute
Southeastern Branch Library
Torrington Branch Library
Waterbury Branch Library

Law School Library
MBA Library
Social Work Library

The statements will be reviewed and used as a basis for determining the allocation of the book budget. Tentative allocations will be made where deemed necessary and a procedure will be established to allow for appeals before the final allocations are made.

The departments and libraries are free to order materials within the parameters established by the program statement, by the allocation, and following guidelines that regulate the expenditure of the book budget. The Acquisitions Department staff will conduct a seminar in the fall to acquaint the Department Heads/Supervisors with the guidelines and factors that influence the mechanics of ordering library materials.

It should be noted that the allocations should cover expenditures throughout the year and satisfy individual requests from faculty and students as well as library staff. All orders for materials for the University Library at Storrs will be issued through the Acquisitions Department.

The Acquisitions Department will be responsible for the accounting procedures for each allocation for the Storrs campus indicating the amount allocated, encumbered, expended and remaining. The Head of the Acquisitions Department will submit a status report on the budget to the Administrative Meeting for review at the first meeting in December, March, April and May. The departments and libraries receiving allocations will be informed of the status of their budget at the same time. Additional reports will be submitted at any time a major problem occurs such as additions or restrictions to the book budget. The branch and professional school libraries will notify the Acquisitions Department of the status of their budget including the amount allocated, encumbered, expended and remaining, on the last week of November and March.

A contingency fund will be available for use by the Acquisitions Department. If sufficient monies are available near the end of the year, the Head of the Acquisitions Department will notify the Administrative Meeting of the amount available. At that time requests for additional items for purchase from departments and libraries may be considered. However the ordering of these items will be at the discretion of the Acquisitions Department following the established guidelines.

June 7, 1976

Request for budget information

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ANN ARBOR
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

DECISION-MAKING
Univ. of Michigan
4 pp.

Although a firm allocation of the book budget for 1976/77 cannot be made until the amount available for book purchases is known, we would like to gather as much information as we can, particularly about new programs and unfilled needs, to include in our consideration.

The following is a summary of your funds for 1975/76:

1975/76 Allocation for_____ $_____ (_____from formal budget)
(_____from University grant)

Supplementary grants $_____
Available balance $_____(according to statement of June 15)*
1975/76 expenditures to date:
Monographs $_____ Serials $_____
Outstanding orders:
Monographs $_____ Serials $_____

Your answers to the following questions will help us to gauge how nearly this year's allocation has met your needs, and the amount you estimate you will require in the future. Feel free to reply in any convenient form.

1) Have the funds been adequate to acquire the most needed books and journals?

2) If not, describe generally the desiderata you are holding. Estimate the amount needed to acquire them.

3) Is there any part of the subject field less important or less expensive than formerly?

4) Do any cooperative projects offer promise of enlarging your resources or reducing expenditures?

5) Do you know of new courses or programs planned for next year or for future years? Can you estimate the cost of supporting them?

You will realize that we cannot promise to increase your allocation so as to provide for the needs you express. At this time it seems probable that the total book fund for 1976/77 will be close to the amount available for 1975/76, but some adjustment of the allocations will be necessary. Your information will help us prepare a set of allocations which will provide for our known needs to the extent possible.

* If further details are desired, please call Mona East, 763-3420, or Edna Laughrey, 764-9371.

89

Mona East
Selection Officer and Chairman,
Materials Selection Policy Committee

FOR INTRA-UNIVERSITY CORRESPONDENCE

Letter accompanying budget allocation

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Selection Office

September 22, 1976

TO:

FROM: Mona East, Selection Office

SUBJECT: Book Budget for 1976/77

The allocation of the University Library's book budget for 1976/77 has been approved by the Materials Selction Policy Committee, the Executive Council and the Director. The allocations are based on the records of expenditure in the previous year and on the information we have received on unfilled needs and new courses, and the judgment as to the adequacy of the book funds expressed by the librarians in charge.

The allocation for the Director's Special fund for 1976/77 is

$5,000	from the formal budget
6,500	from the University grant
$11,500	TOTAL

As you know, the University grant may be used only for one-time expenditures, including monographs, antiquarian orders, back files of serials, etc. Continuing expenditures such as serial subscriptions and orders for works published in parts must be limited to the amount of the allocation from the formal budget, which may of course be used for one-time purchase if you choose.

To help you monitor your continuing expenditures, the appropriate page of a table showing the amounts spent for continuing expenditures (renewals) in 1974/75 and 1975/76 and the percentage of the formal budget spent for renewals in 1975/76 is attached. We shall send you further reports during the year of expenditures for renewals; your book fund statements will show the estimate of the amount which will be needed to pay for renewals not yet paid for.

Serials subscriptions are of course much more important and their cost a much more difficult problem in some fields, chiefly the scientific and technical subjects, than in others. We have tried to arrange the allocations so that each fund has an adequate allocation from the formal budget to cover their subscriptions. It is essential to stay within these limits.

If you have any questions about your allocation, the book budget in general, or the records of serials expenditures, please call the Selection Office 763-3420.

ME:mp

FOR INTRA-UNIVERSITY CORRESPONDENCE

Letter on serials commitment
Sent to libraries with
large need for serial

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Selection Office

September 30, 1976

TO:

FROM: Mona East, Selection Officer

SUBJECT: Serial Subscriptions in the 1976/77 Book Budget

_____ is one of the funds which has a large need and commitment for serial subscriptions. In allocating the book budget for 1976/77 we have increased the amount of your allocation from the formal budget, so that you can, we hope, continue to receive the serials you consider important. This could be done only by reducing the formal budget allocation (not the total) for some funds which need fewer serials. The Materials Selection Policy Committee, the Executive Council and Dr. Wagman approved this way of allocating the budget for 1976/77 with the provision that is must be understood that these allocations may be counted on for this year only. The total allocation will be the basis for allocating next year's book budget.

It is possible that we may have to reduce the amount of your allocation from the formal budget (the only part available for serial subscriptions) in 1977/78 or some future year, if we are not fortunate in the total book budget. If it becomes necessary to reduce serial subscriptions at any time in the future, it will have to be done quickly, because of the timing of serial payments. Please be sure to keep a list of the least used or least important serials on your fund — those which you would choose to cancel if cancellations should become necessary.

For the long run we must continue to work toward identifying less used serials for which we can rely on access through the Center for Research Libraries and other cooperative programs. The number and cost of serials needed in a research library continues to increase; we must find ways to provide access to them without allowing serial costs to absorb so much of the budget that other needs, such as reserve books, new monographs and binding are jeopardized.

By allocating the book budget as we have we can continue adequate serial subscriptions for this year, but we must be prepared to reduce them quickly if it becomes necessary and we must continue our efforts to identify titles for which access through a cooperative program is sufficient.

Please call me if you have any questions, and I should welcome your comments.

ME:mp

Proposal for Reducing Serials Expenditures for 1977/78
(if necessary)

The March report indicates that 70% of the formal budget is involved for serials. Seventy-five percent (75%) was the limit established at the beginning of the budget year, and we are likely to reach it if there are any unforeseen price increases.

For 1977/78 it appears likely that the book budget will not be increased, while subscriptions will certainly cost more. I believe we must be prepared to cut subscriptions as soon as we have fairly firm information on next year's budget. I am writing to the selectors in charge of each fund, and should like to go over with the Committee what I am proposing:

> Funds with approximately 50% of their formal budget involved for serials -- UGL, the area programs, Fine Arts, Architecture and Music -- need not plan to cancel subscriptions. I am asking them to inform the Selection Office if they plan to add many subscriptions, as this would reduce the margin for miscalculation in the overall budget.
>
> The Graduate Library, at 70% involved for serials, need not cut subscriptions for budget reasons, but may wish to in order to free funds for other purchases.
>
> The Medical Center Library and many of the divisional libraries have 80-100% and more of their formal allocations involved for serials. I believe they must be prepared to cut subscriptions enough to allow for price increases, if the formal budget is the same for 1977/78, and further if there is any decrease in the budget. There is not enough margin to allow for average price increases by further changes in the distribution of the funds. I am proposing that the Medical Center Library prepare to reduce the amount for serial subscriptions to 80% of the formal budget allocation, and that the divisional libraries be prepared to cut similarly to 75% of the formal budget allotted to <u>all</u> the divisional libraries.

It may not be necessary actually to make these cuts, but I believe it is imperative that we be prepared to, so that if it proves to be necessary it can be done early in the fiscal year 1977/78.

MAE/clc

BOOK ACQUISITION IN McMASTER UNIVERSITY LIBRARY: A PROPOSAL FOR CHANGE

DECISION-MAKING
McMaster
7 pp.

January, 1976

In little over two decades, the University Library has increased the size of its collections ten-fold. The number of publications available today is far in excess of the number available just ten years ago. However, the mechanism whereby books are acquired has remained fundamentally unchanged for years, and current methods of book fund allocation can often bear little relation to the needs of the University and its Library collections. Our present means of book acquisition are not ineffective, but there is great potential for improvement when our existing structure is considered.

The attached proposal identifies and discusses a number of areas and functions in the acquisition process, and attempts to show how the University's resources, both human and financial, could be used in a more effective way. The present focus on financial control and book purchasing should be replaced by a focus on financial planning and collection development.

C O N T E N T S

I. Acquisition fund allocation and departmental budgets

II. Existing book acquisition methods and the role of the Library Representatives

III. Proposals for change

APPENDIX I. Library Acquisition: current procedures

APPENDIX II. Library Collections Policies

A. Relationship between collections policies, appraisal and acquisitions policy
B. Suggested format

I. ACQUISITION FUND ALLOCATION AND DEPARTMENTAL BUDGETS

McMaster University Library, like all other university libraries, has available to it annually a sum of money with which to develop its collections. Here, these funds are largely controlled by the Academic Vice-President and the teaching departments through book fund allocations, and administered (or spent) on their behalf by the University Librarian and the library staff. At this time there are a total of fifty-five separate fund allocations. These correspond largely to academic departments, but the correspondence is not exact, and over the years there have been established separate funds for individual programmes (e.g. Graduate Teaching, Dramatic Arts, Urban Studies) and one fund (Business Administration) is used as a faculty allocation.

The University Librarian is responsible for the preparation of the Library Acquisitions budget, in consultation with teaching departments, Chairmen and library representatives. All material to be purchased against departmental allocations is recommended for purchase by the members of the university community, and customarily routed via a "library representative" who has the authority within his or her department to make commitments upon the book funds. In some of the larger departments, the representative is often Chairman of a departmental library committee, in which case, he or she will also be responsible for the monitoring of expenditure against the department's fund.

A survey of library literature in recent years shows that many librarians and university staff believe that fair and equitable fund allocation results in balanced, well-developed, library collections. The mathematical models produced for fund allocation are designed to avoid what are regarded as the twin evils of partiality in allocation and absence of allocation.[1] A great deal of time and research has been directed towards developing a formula for allocation with as few variables as possible, but there has been little real questioning of the basic assumption that traditional fund allocation to a departmental level is necessary or desirable.

1. See, for example, McGrath, William et al. "An Allocation Formula Derived from a Factor Analysis of Academic Departments" in *College and Research Libraries*: 30 (January 1969) pp. 51-62.

The apportionment of book funds among academic divisions, departments or institutes, goes back to the late nineteenth century, when it was devised, like conscience, "to keep the strong in awe." There is a very general feeling that without such allocation, "the strong" will devour all, or a major part, of the funds available. It is also considered as a means of ensuring against the bias of the library staff to, for example, Social Sciences against Humanities, to Geology against Physics. A lot of effort is put into developing departmental book fund allocations. Librarians, and more often committees, invariably make use of some kind of data to develop book budgets. The kinds of data used runs the whole gamut from pure subjectivity to the bare evidence of book circulation statistics. Intermediate factors on this scale would be the number of students served (as F.T.E. or by hours of attendance) the number of faculty, the cost of an average book in a discipline, dollar-spending in the previous year, etc.[2] The relevance or irrelevance of such data to collection development can be debated ad nauseam. The fact remains that the existing method of book fund allocation is essentially an economic control device that is far more subject to politics and partiality than a positive attempt to match available resources to planned objectives. Dissatisfaction or despair has led some libraries to abandon book budgeting, but resource allocation, whether specifically budgeted or informal, should not, and indeed cannot, be abandoned. Progress lies in the application of the concepts of project budgeting to the Library's collections development. The result may have the appearance of abandoning allocation in favour of "one big fund" but in reality it is an attempt to match resources to objectives which have been agreed upon by the university community through appropriate committees.

The present system is one which emphasizes economic control over collection development. It does not, in fact, achieve economic control at a departmental level. In practice, a department which overspends its allocation early in the fiscal year is not automatically "cut off" and prevented from ordering to exceed its budget. Assuming the department had spent its allocation wisely, would there be any real sense in not buying another book in say, English Literature, for six months or so?

2. See Revill, D. "A Bookfund Allocation Formula" in *New Library World:* 75 (August 1974) pp. 162-63.

The collection would inevitably suffer - probably irreparably today, in times of short-print runs and escalating warehouse and labour costs.

The acquisition staff of this library, like all others, is geared to spending the book funds as closely as possibly within the budgetary allocations made to the departments. This results of necessity in partial treatment. Theoretically, all recommendations should be processed "evenly" or in the order in which they are received, in order to give fair treatment to all the departments. However, with budgets of varying size, this is manifestly impossible. Many factors that are not fiscal influence the staff processing time that is accorded to each department. Principal among these are the form and type of the recommendations that are made. If Department A has a budget of $50,000 and generates recommendations for books of which 50% are already in the library or on order, and Department B has a budget of $20,000 and generates recommendations for books of which only 15% are in the library or on order, then ironically, Department B despite the fact that it requires a greater proportion of books the Library does not own, is necessarily penalized in staff resource allocation. The Library will have to process approximately 6,600 recommendations from Department A to expend that budget, but only 1,500 from Department B. This clearly cannot be reconciled with the fair treatment of rotational processing. Also, if the greater part of those 6,600 recommendations are transmitted only in the last three months of the fiscal year, then all available staff resources would have to be given over exclusively to the Department for a month or so in order to expend its budget. It is not useful to have recourse in such a situation to fault and economic penalty, for it is ultimately the collections that will suffer.

There is a very general belief that failure by a department to spend its budget fully each year will result in a decreased allocation the following year. This is probably in part a result of the approach encouraged by traditional "dollar-spending" budgeting, which has always been one of the factors for budget allocation. As many of the factors relating to book acquisition are beyond the control of the department, it is impossible to even contend that Department X "has no need of a large budget, because it spent only 50% of its allocation this year" or "has need of a larger budget because it has overspent by 50%."

The factors affecting dollar-spending at a Departmental level are too complex for easy explanation. In reviewing a department's budget spending record, the following matters must be taken into consideration: the effectiveness of blanket orders; the interdisciplinary nature of many of the books published; the knowledge of the subject collections by both faculty and library staff; the availability of needed material; the fluctuating pressures upon an acquisitions staff of constant size; the nature and demands of the collections and acquisitions policy of other departments, and so on. These are just some of the factors which influence the year end spending figures of the departments, and yet the purpose of budgeting is presumably to spend funds as closely as possible to the framework of departmental budgets on an annual basis.

Informal attempts have been made in the past to apply three or five-year averaging to spending figures, for it is generally true that the years of overspending by a particular department will have been counterbalanced by the years that it has underspent its budget. If such an approach is valid, and it would appear to have more to recommend it than an isolated twelve-month period, then the existing annual budget would appear to be at the very least unhelpful in the business of book acquisition.

III. PROPOSALS FOR CHANGE

The preceding sections briefly outline the Library acquisition process, and a number of the problems related to the existing book budgeting framework and the development of the Library's collections. Any proposals for fundamental change in the current operational philosophy or methods must of necessity not only be considered carefully, but also tried and tested if at all possible before full implementation. It is impossible to explain in a few pages the complexity and wealth of detail that lies behind an acquisitions system in a research library. It is likewise impossible to explore in a few hours or days the ramifications of proposed changes at all necessary levels, and with all user-interest groups. Consequently, the initial proposals given here are of two kinds: firstly, proposals of principle, (R1 and R2) and secondly recommendations for initial steps that might be taken to test the validity and feasibility of translating the principles into practice (R3-R5). It should be noted that the proposed steps that might be taken with respect to next fiscal year (1976/77) do not in any way prevent a return to the status quo in the following fiscal year (1977/78).

R1: That it be accepted in principle that the traditional book fund budgeting process be replaced by a process which focuses upon matching available funds to agreed collection development objectives.

R2: That it be accepted in principle that the appropriate function of library representatives and the various departmental library committees is to define as precisely as possible through collections development and acquisitions policies the limits within which the Library staff should work.

R3: With a view to establishing a consolidated current publications fund for each of the Mills Library and the Science and Engineering Library, the present book fund accounting matrix will be maintained during fiscal 1976/77, but monthly financial reports will not be made to library representatives. In place of these reports, total dollar spending and commitment figures will be reported, by faculty, on a monthly basis, to each of the User

Committees via the Chairmen of these committees. This will involve no change in the present system of the routing of recommendations through a library representative.

R4: With a view to establishing a division of the book acquisition funds that have not been set aside in consolidated current publications accounts, and which will be used for developing a subject field retrospectively, extending its current base, or developing a special interest collection, each department or unit will be requested to develop from its existing collection policy a ranked statement of collection priorities, making full use of whatever appraisal report or opinion is available. In consultation with the University Librarian and his staff, attempts will then be made to establish an acquisitions policy for each subject or discipline. These policies will then be consolidated through the appropriate User Committee.

R5: That the University Librarian and his staff will, during the next twelve months, investigate with library representatives on an individual basis the feasibility of meeting the needs of a department or faculty in respect of the mainstream of current publications through blanket order programmes or other appropriate acquisition methods, which are not based largely on the generation of individual book recommendations.

Princeton University: DEPARTMENT/University Library

To Mr. R. W. Boss

DATE 21 April 1976

SUBJECT Draft of Recommendations

FROM Ad Hoc Selection Policy Committee

DECISION-MAKING
Princeton
5 pp.

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

An ad hoc Selection Policy Committee was appointed in February 1976 to investigate alternatives for "bringing our ordering of materials for the Princeton University Library within its budget."

After study of the library's acquisitions budgeting and accounting practices and expenditures, a review of selection policies in use in two other major university libraries, a review of the literature regarding allocation systems, and some consultation with library staff, we submit the following recommendations for discussion. It should be noted that the items present are not in priority order.

I. Allocation system.

A. Distribution of funds:

1. 70% allocated to subject/department areas;

2. 5% for general purchases (e.g. newspapers, general interest periodicals and monographs);

3. 25% initially unallocated for use as a contingency fund (should be this large for the initial year).

B. Based on:

1. Teaching as indicated by:

a. number of undergraduate concentrators;

b. number of graduate students;

c. number of undergraduate courses offered;

d. number of graduate courses offered;

e. number of undergraduate course enrollments;

f. number of graduate course enrollments

g. number of FTE (full-time equivalent) teaching faculty.

2. Research of students, faculty and others as indicated by:

   a. number of students;

   b. number of faculty;

   c. number of research staff.

3. Output and pricing of publications in the field (where available).

4. Need to maintain strengths of the collection. Previous expenditures in subject areas, including area studies, are to be considered.

5. Restricted endowments.

6. Special supplemental funds.

7. The University Library's general funds should support all those areas to which the university and/or the library has a commitment. Some areas with special funds (endowments and/or supplemental funds) might not find it necessary to draw from the university-appropri portion of the budget.

8. Need to provide general information in subject areas not covered by instructional or research programs (e.g. geography, agriculture).

9. Allocations to library departments to provide for extraordinary expenses (e.g. quinquennial cumulation of Science Citation Index).

10. Units that do not spend all of one year's allocation should be able to carry funds forward to the following year.

C. The allocation system should be well controlled and regularly reviewed.

1. Subject specialists are to consider the overall financial implications of their ordering activity.

2. One subject specialist should be responsibile for the review and approval or rejection of all order recommendations in that subject area whether submitted by another subject specialist, faculty, staff or students.

3. A list of library and faculty subject specialists responsible for ordering in specific fields should be maintained and reviewed. Subject specialists should maintain liaison with faculty.

4. Subject specialists in overlapping areas are to consult with one another in areas of mutual concern.

5. All items purchased are to be categorized by a fund or subject designation.

TO: Mr. R. W. Boss FROM: Ad Hoc Selection Policy Committee SUBJ: Draft of Recomm.

6. Separate allocations should be made for the following areas:

   a. Reserve (all reserve duplicates, regardless of location);

   b. Rare books;

   c. General library working tools (e.g., Library of Congress classification schedules, Publishers' Trade List Annual);

   d. Reference materials for Firestone Reference room;

   e. General interest titles purchased for Firestone stacks (e.g. Time, Newsweek).

7. Transfer of allocated funds should be permitted after consultation with concerned subject specialists.

8. Ad hoc library committees composed of appropriate subject specialists should review unusually expensive items (e.g.: $250 for humanities and social sciences; $500 for science and technology).

II. Selection policy.

A selection policy setting forth the aims of the selection process (e.g. levels of collection: undergraduate, graduate, research, etc.) should be designed. A suitable process for formal collection evaluation should be developed and carried out as soon as possible.

A. Suggested model: Stanford University Libraries.

B. Review of balance of collection, e.g., strengths and weaknesses.

C. Coordination of selection policy efforts should be the responsibility of a committee.

D. Responsibility for drafting selection policies will fall to the individual who has authority over the allocation.

E. Selection policies should be tied to a comprehensive service policy.

F. A system should be established for reviewing and updating the selection policy in consultation with the university community.

G. There should be cooperation with other libraries in the region in collection development.

III. Financial record keeping.

Immediate consideration should be given to automating library financial record

TO: Mr. K. W. Boss FROM: Ad Hoc Selection Policy Committee SUBJ: Draft of Recomm.

IV. Financial reporting.

Beginning 1 July 1976, bi-weekly or monthly reports of expenditures, encumbrances, and year-to-date commitments on each allocation should be reported to the Librarian, Associate Librarian, department heads and all subject specialists. Until an automated accounting system is established, additional bookkeeping staff may be required to provide this kind of reporting.

A. A detailed encumbrance and payment report is needed which will keep records for each subject area/department in two segments:

1. Serials;

2. Monographs.

B. When an order is cancelled or otherwise removed from the current outstanding record, the encumbrance total for that fund should be adjusted and the subject specialist so notified.

V. Other financial considerations.

A. The concepts of gift monies and/or departmental transfers relieving general funds should be carefully scrutinized and judiciously applied as such an approach tends to negate incentive of the fund-raiser, the donor, and the department.

B. Expenses for standard bindings should be charged to general library funds. The difference in cost between standard and special bindings should be charged to their respective subject allocations.

VI. Complete computerized published periodical listing.

A complete listing of all current periodical holdings should be compiled as soon as possible.

VII. Review of separate collections.

A critical review of the number and type of separately housed collections should be undertaken at the earliest convenience (e.g. Street, PIC).

VIII. Organizational memberships.

The practice of charging organizational memberships for other than acquisition purposes to the book/serial fund should be reviewed.

Submitted by:

D. Hoelle - Co-chairman
T. Wiggins - Co-chairman
K. Farrell
S. Kim
A. Wainwright
P. Waage

Dee Hoelle
Terry Higgins

Princeton University: Department of the Library

To Faculty, Library Heads, and Professional Librarians

Date May 24, 1976

Subject

From Richard W. Boss, University Librarian

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

Thank you for your letters and phone calls about the Selection Policy Committee's draft report. There appears to be general support for its recommendations. We have made the following changes in response to your comments:

(1) Added level of sponsored research support to the factors to be considered in evaluating the impact of research.

(2) Added another factor for planned major expansion or contraction of program.

(3) Have all units, except those with major contractions of program, retain as a base allocation the average expenditure of the past three years with adjustments distributed according to the factors identified by the Committee.

(4) Broken down each factor into high, moderate and low intensity, with each unit's increase for 1976-77 to be determined by the mix. For example, a unit with low enrollment, low research, high publishing output and high prices would receive a larger increase than one that was low in all factors.

(5) Provided for tentative allocations to be reviewed by the Faculty Library Committee before the 6th of June.

We will use the allocation system for 1976-77. We will seek to develop selection policies during the year for use in 1977-78. The allocation system will then become a back-up system. We'll stay in touch with you.

Cordially,

Rick Boss

Richard W. Boss

12 April 1976

THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO

LIBRARY SYSTEM

THE FORMULATION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRAM OF ACQUISITIONS

DECISION-MAKING
Univ. of Western Ontario
3 pp.

The building of library collections at The University of Western Ontario begins with the collections policy statement which is supplied to the Library System by each Academic Department or other appropriate Academic Unit within the constituent University. The collections policy outlines in appropriate detail what is needed to support the existing instructional and research programs of each Academic Unit and states as clearly as possible the priorities which exist with respect to those needs. The information supplied in the collections policy along with the following factors are reviewed each year and used in the design of the Library System's program of acquisitions:

1. The strengths and weaknesses of the existing collections as determined by collections appraisal.

2. Availability of budget resources to purchase materials.

3. The cost of materials including average costs and anticipated rates of inflation.

4. The use given materials (i.e. what materials are used and how frequently) by subject (Library of Congress Classification), by language of publication, and imprint date based on circulation records, tabulations of in-house use (periodicals), and individual library staff knowledge of collections usage.

5. The number of faculty employed in each Academic Unit plus the number of students enrolled in the academic programs offered.
6. The availability of materials in the marketplace.
7. The number of new titles published annually (e.g. the number of new titles published each year in History greatly exceeds the number published in Journalism).
8. The availability of physical and staff resources in the Library System to select, bibliographically check, order, receive, catalogue, and house required materials.
9. The statistical record of orders placed in previous fiscal years by Faculty or Academic Department.
10. The acquisitions programs operated by the provincially supported Universities in the Province of Ontario and the availability of infrequently used materials from those Universities.

All of these factors are taken into account in the formulation of the acquisitions program and the establishment of concrete guidelines for selection to be followed by the collections staff including the average weekly and monthly rate at which each collections librarian is allowed to select materials for purchase. The latter is essential for two reasons:

1. To ensure as fully as possible, an orderly, continuous, and even flow of work through the Processing Division.

2. To ensure that every academic program operated by the University receives an adequate and equitable measure of library support in relation to required library materials.

In view of the growing financial restraint placed upon the University, the continuing inflationary price increases in the cost of library materials, the capacity of the Library System to process and make materials available for consultation, and the growing lack of available space to house them, it is increasingly necessary to concentrate the collections building program on the acquisition of those materials which are most needed and which have the greatest priority in support of established academic programs. Consequently, the development of a collection in support of an anticipated or desired program is undertaken only in those instances in which there is a clear indication that such a program will be or is likely to be established (e.g. additional funds have been specifically provided for the purpose of building a collection of library materials in support of an academic program, the University wishes to undertake). From the point of view of materials for academic research, financial constraints also require that library collections be developed only in those areas which Faculties and Departments have indicated a research specialization.